

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Tolstoy as a Student of the Classics	Chauncey E. Finch	205
The Psychiatric Cases in Horace, <i>Satires</i> 2.3	Ernestine F. Leon	211
Dramatic Art in Aeschylus' <i>Agamemnon</i>	H. L. Tracy	215
The Problem of the Second Burial in Sophocles' <i>Antigone</i>	J. L. Rose	219
A Poet's-Eye View of Philosophy	Edward B. Stevens	222
"We See by the Papers"	John F. Latimer	227
Notes		
Notes on Horace as a "Metaphysical" Poet	Bruce Dearing	230
Streamlined Latin	J. C. Morgan	231
<i>De Usu Linguae Latinae</i>	Johannes A. Gaertner	234
Classical Articles in Non-Classical Periodicals	Edward L. Bassett	236
<i>Vade Mecum</i> for Classics Students	Samuel A. Ives	238
"Trends and Events"	William M. Seaman	239
The Review Cupboard	Grundy Steiner	241
Book Reviews		
Gods, Graves, and Scholars (Ceram, tr. Garside)	Francis D. Lazenby	243
Studies Presented to David Moore Robinson (Mylonas)	George M. A. Hanfmann	244
The Epicureanism of Titus Pomponius Atticus (Leslie)	William C. Grummel	246
Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome	Walter Allen, Jr.	246
The Greeks (Kitto)	Herbert N. Couch	247
Opportunities for Teachers		248
Classical Association of New England		250

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor-in-Chief and Business Manager: CLYDE MURLEY, Northwestern University.

Assistant Editor, Book Reviews: GRUNDY STEINER, Northwestern University.

"Notes": OSCAR E. NYBAKKEN, State University of Iowa.

"Trends and Events": DORRANCE S. WHITE, State University of Iowa.

"Classical Articles in Non-Classical Periodicals": EDWARD L. BASSETT, University of Washington.

"We See by the Papers": JOHN F. LATIMER, 706 20th St., N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

For the Atlantic States: FRANKLIN B. KRAUSS, Pennsylvania State College.

For New England: JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS, Trinity College.

For the Pacific States: W. M. GREEN, University of California.

Associate Editors: GRACE L. BEEDE, University of South Dakota; W. M. GREEN, University of California; GEORGE E. LANE, Thayer Academy, Braintree, Mass.; FRANKLIN H. POTTER, State University of Iowa; F. STUART CRAWFORD, Boston University; EUGENE MILLER, University of Pittsburgh.

CORRESPONDENCE

Address all general editorial correspondence, MSS etc. to

CLYDE MURLEY, 629 Noyes St., Evanston 16, Ill.; departmental materials to the proper editors listed above; MSS from the Atlantic, New England, and Pacific States to the regional editors above; subscriptions and details of circulation to Sec'y-Treas. JOHN N. HOUGH, 8E Hellems Hall, University of Colorado, Boulder.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

The general subscription price is \$3.75 (USA), \$4.00 (foreign). Single copies 60¢ (USA), 65¢ (foreign); subscriptions for less than a year at the single copy rate. Teachers and other interested individuals may subscribe through one of the regional associations below, annual membership-subscription rate, \$3.75. Members may subscribe also to the *CLASSICAL OUTLOOK* and *CLASSICAL WEEKLY*; for rates consult the regional secretary-treasurer. Members of CAMWS and CAAS have the option of receiving either the *CLASSICAL JOURNAL* or *CLASSICAL WEEKLY* (published by CAAS).

MEMBERSHIPS

Address the Secretary-Treasurer of the appropriate regional association. CAMWS, JOHN N. HOUGH, 8E Hellems Hall, University of Colorado, Boulder. CANE, F. STUART CRAWFORD, 725 Commonwealth Ave., Boston 19. CAAS, EUGENE MILLER, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh 13. CAPS (Northern), MRS. WINIFRED E. WETER, Seattle Pacific College, Seattle 99. (Central), E. Y. LINDSAY, Grant Union H.S., Del Paso Heights, Calif. (Southern), MRS. JANE M. INFELD, 10474 Eastbourne Ave., Los Angeles 24. But for 1951-52 only, subscriptions to MRS. LINDSAY as general secretary-treasurer of CAPS.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL is published by the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Inc., with the cooperation of the Classical Association of New England, the Classical Association of the Pacific States, and the Classical Association of the Atlantic States. The annual volume consists of eight issues (October through May).

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Menasha, Wis. on October 19, 1934 with an additional entry at Boulder, Colorado. Entered under Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on October 19, 1934.

Printed by the George Banta Publishing Company, Menasha, Wisconsin, U.S.A.

A new associate for Professor Bassett, upon the resignation of Professor Spaeth, has been found. So the other section of the alphabet in "Classical Articles in Non-Classical Periodicals" will be as far as possible brought up to date.

III;
isted
and
ctions
N.
rado,

\$4.00
sub-
rate.
sub-
elow,
nbers
and
ecre-
AAS
Joun-

ropriate
N, SE
AVE,
Ave.,
ty of
Mis
le 99.
Paso
0474
only,
etary-

h the
d the
(May).

entry
ostage

other
up to

Tolstoy as a Student of the Classics

INTEREST IN THE CLASSICS in the family of Lyev Nikolayevich Tolstoy dates back to an early period.¹ In the first volume of his three volume biography of Count Tolstoy, P. Biryukov indicates that the novelist's great-great-great grandfather, Peter Tolstoy (who died in 1729), produced two well known translations: one of the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid, and another of a work entitled *Administration of the Turkish State*.²

The next recorded manifestation of interest in things classical in the Tolstoy family takes an entirely different form. To aid the above mentioned Biryukov in the preparation of his biography, Tolstoy recorded for him some of his recollections of his childhood days. In these recollections Tolstoy notes that the person who, next to his father and mother, exerted the greatest influence on his life was a certain distant relative, Tatyana Alyexandrovna Yergolskaya, who had been adopted by his grandmother and brought up as one of her own children. Hence Tolstoy had always addressed her as "aunt" and cherished her as an actual member of the family. "It was impossible," he states, "not to love her for her firm, determined, energetic, and, at the same time, self-sacrificing character. Her character is vividly depicted by the incident of the ruler, about which she often told us as she pointed to a scar burnt on her arm between the elbow and wrist, extending almost to the palm of her hand." In his "aunt's" childhood days, as Tolstoy explains the incident, she and the other chil-

dren of the family, after reading the story of Gaius Mucius Scaevola, began debating among themselves as to whether anyone of them would have the courage to do what the Roman had done. When his "aunt" indicated that she would be willing, one of the other children, Yazykov by name, lighted a ruler in the flame of a candle, held it in front of her, and challenged her to put her arm against it. To quote Tolstoy's own words, "She extended her bare arm . . . and Yazykov applied to it the burning ruler. She frowned, but did not withdraw her arm, and groaned only when the ruler was pulled away with the skin clinging to it. When her elders saw her arm and began inquiring what had happened, she exclaimed that she had done this of her own volition, because she wanted to experience what Mucius Scaevola had experienced."³

Since Tolstoy emphasizes the influence exerted on him by this "aunt," and since the traits of character which he attributes to her are the very ones for which he was known, especially in the later years of his life, and since, in a comparatively brief account of his childhood, he mentions his "aunt's" imitation of Gaius Mucius Scaevola as a manifestation of her character, it seems reasonable to assume that the story of this Roman exerted at least some indirect influence in moulding the character of Tolstoy himself.

Little is known of Tolstoy's experiences as a student of Latin in the days before he

entered the university. In the absence of written records it may be presumed that he had much the same course of training in the subject as any other youthful member of the Russian aristocracy of that day. Certain attitudes held by him in later years suggest that great emphasis was laid on the study of grammar. In 1844 Tolstoy sought admission to the Department of Oriental Languages of Kazanski University, with a view to preparing himself for a diplomatic career. A record has been preserved of the results of the entrance examination which he took in May of that year. In this examination he made the equivalent of B in religion, mathematics, logic, Russian, and English, A in German, Arabic, and Turkish, A+ in French, but only D in Latin. It is a curious fact that the same person who some twenty years later was to produce the greatest historical novel ever written, in this examination failed completely in history and geography, and for that reason was denied admission to the university.⁴ In August, however, his appeal for a reexamination in these subjects was granted, he succeeded in passing the second examination, and so was allowed to enter the university in the autumn of 1844.⁵ After being admitted, however, Tolstoy led such a gay life that his studies suffered considerably.⁶ In fact, he failed to make an appearance for the spring examination, and so was denied promotion to the second year course.⁷ Rather than repeat the first year work in Oriental Languages, Tolstoy transferred to the first year juridical course.⁸ During the ensuing year he apparently took the study of Latin more seriously, since his grade in that subject in the spring examination was B.⁹ His heart was not in school work, however, for in the spring of the next year, 1847, he asked to be allowed to withdraw from the university.¹⁰ A letter of reference given to him at the time by university officials states that his work in Latin had been "good."¹¹

As he was preparing to leave the university and return to his native village, Tolstoy recorded in his diary a series of resolutions and directives for his own guidance. One of these resolutions was "to study

the following languages: French, Russian, German, English, Italian, and Latin."¹² Whether the position of Latin at the end of the list has any special significance is not known. The last directive included by Tolstoy in this entry in his diary gives a hint as to why his earlier progress in Latin had not been greater. It reads, "Look on the society of women as a necessary evil of social life and stay away from them as much as possible."¹³

A short time thereafter Tolstoy's study of Latin was halted, temporarily at least, by his entry into military service.¹⁴ His literary career, which began during this term of military service, occasionally reflects the influence of his Latin studies. Like many other Russian writers of the period, he is fond of scattering Latin quotations and references to mythology through his stories and letters. To cite just one example for purposes of illustration, he wrote to the poet A. A. Fet, Nov. 17, 1864, while he was engaged in composing *War and Peace*, as follows: "I have written a fair amount on my novel this fall. I keep thinking every day, *Ars longa, vita brevis est*."¹⁵ In view of the fact that *War and Peace*, in its final form, is about 1500 pages long, the quotation may be considered appropriate in a double sense. In his story, "Sevastopol in May, 1855," Tolstoy represents one of his characters, an army doctor, as diagnosing cases brought into a military hospital in Latin. The quality of the Latin employed is fairly high. In his later years, when he became deeply interested in religious and philosophical problems, Tolstoy made extensive use of Latin in his study of the *Vulgate* and various philosophical works written in this language.

During his university career or shortly thereafter Tolstoy became interested in the Greek classics in translation. He himself provided his biographer, Biryukov, with lists of books which influenced him most in various periods of his life. The list submitted for the years from the age of 20 to 35 includes the *Phaedo* and the *Symposium* of Plato and the works of Homer in Russian translations.¹⁶ In the fall of 1870 Tolstoy indicated in a letter

to Fet that he had become much interested in drama. "... I want to talk with you about this," he writes. "In this, as in everything else, you are a classicist and understand the situation thoroughly. I should also like to read Sophocles and Euripides."¹⁷

The diary of Tolstoy's wife contains the following statement in an entry for December 9, 1870: "At the present moment Lyev is sitting in the living room with a seminary student and is taking his first lesson in the Greek language. The idea of studying Greek came to him suddenly."¹⁸ In another entry in her diary, dated March 27, 1871, Countess Tolstoy gives the following account of her husband's progress in the study of Greek: "Since December he has stubbornly been studying the Greek language. It's obvious that nothing in the world interests and delights him more than each newly learned Greek word or newly mastered phrase. He first read Xenophon and at present is reading, now Plato, now the *Odyssey* and *Iliad*, over which he goes into ecstasy. It pleases him very much when you listen to his oral translation and correct it by checking it with Gnedich, whose translation he finds very good and very conscientious. His progress in Greek, as it seems to me on the basis of inquiries about the knowledge of others, even of people who have finished a course in the university, can be considered almost unbelievably great. Sometimes, in checking his translation for three or four pages, I find only two or three words and an occasional phrase which have been misunderstood."¹⁹

In a note entitled "Tolstoy and Greek," Warren E. Blake²⁰ quotes a translation of a letter written by Tolstoy to Fet in December, 1870, in which the novelist gives much the same information about his progress in Greek as is contained in the account by his wife just quoted. In this letter Tolstoy, referring to his ability to read Greek at sight, states: "I eagerly await a chance of showing this new trick to some one." S. A. Bers reports in his "Recollections of Tolstoy" how the novelist got his chance to show off his "new trick" in the following words: "After completion of his novel *War and Peace*, Lyev

Nikolayevich decided to take up the study of ancient Greek and familiarize himself with the classics. I know for a certainty that he mastered the language and familiarized himself with the work of Herodotus in the course of three months, although he had previously known absolutely nothing about the Greek language. While he was in Moscow, he paid a visit to the late Professor P. M. Lyeontyev of the Katkovski Lyceum for the purpose of passing on to him his impressions of the literature of antiquity. Lyeontyev refused to believe in the possibility of such rapid mastery of ancient Greek and proposed reading something at sight with him. In three cases there developed between them a difference of opinion about the translation. After discussion of the matter, the professor acknowledged that Lyev Nikolayevich's interpretations were correct."²¹

After six months of concentration on Greek, Tolstoy became so ill that he had to retire to a health resort for a *kumys* cure.²² Whether his devotion to Greek had anything to do with his bad health cannot be determined with certainty. But his wife was convinced that such was the case, for she wrote to him at this time: "... If you always sit over your Greek, you will never get well. That is what has brought on you this melancholy and indifference to present day life. It is not without reason that this is called a dead language; it inflicts on a person a dead state of mind. Don't think that I don't know why such languages are conventionally called dead. But I myself ascribe this other significance to them."²³

In his list of influential books for this period Tolstoy includes Xenophon's *Anabasis* and the Greek texts of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.²⁴ Some school textbooks written by him at this time contain his own translations of many of the fables of Aesop and selections from Herodotus, thus indicating considerable interest in these works.²⁵ In an entry in his diary for May 22, 1878 Tolstoy remarks, "... I have been reading Parthenius ..."²⁶ And Plato, whose works were now available to him in their original language, continued to interest him.

The question whether so much devotion to the classics exerted any influence over Tolstoy's style is, of course, an interesting one. Countess Tolstoy provides some evidence on the subject when she remarks in her diary in an entry for March 27, 1871: "He [Tolstoy] feels like writing and he often speaks of this. His fondest dream is of composition so pure and so simple that, as in the case of all ancient Greek literature and Greek art, there would be absolutely nothing superfluous. I cannot explain, although I understand clearly just what sort of composition he has in mind. He says that it is not difficult to write something, but rather, it is difficult not to write; that is, to restrain himself from superfluous verbosity—a thing which almost no one ever succeeds in avoiding."²⁷ Any second year student of Russian who has attempted to read any of the Russian classics in the original can vouch for the simplicity of Tolstoy's style as compared with the style of other Russian writers. In view of the above quoted statement of Tolstoy's wife, who followed his work very closely, it seems reasonable to ascribe the novelist's well known simplicity, in part at least, to a conscious imitation of Greek simplicity.

Around the year 1876 a crisis occurred in Tolstoy's spiritual life, in connection with which his knowledge of Latin and Greek were destined to play an important role. In the final chapters of *Anna Karenina*, when Tolstoy represents the hero, Levin, as undergoing a spiritual crisis, he is actually painting a detailed picture of his own experiences and emotions in this period. The novelist had been baptized in, and brought up in accordance with the teachings of, the Russian Orthodox church. But since the days of his youth, he had been somewhat skeptical towards the teachings of his church; and, as a result of a long series of circumstances, which he describes in detail in his work *Confession*, he had completely lost his faith by 1876. He had long been perplexed by the question of the purpose and meaning of human existence. In an effort to find an answer, he studied the writings of many of the philosophers of antiquity, devoting special attention to

Plato. His conclusion was that the ancients had been perplexed by the same problem, but had failed to find the correct answer. The answer given by Socrates, according to Tolstoy's interpretation, could be summarized in the following words: "The life of the body is an evil and a lie. And, for that reason, the destruction of this life of the body is a good thing and should be desired by us."²⁸ This answer he found unsatisfactory. The answers of other philosophers, for one reason or another, proved equally unacceptable. Finally Tolstoy turned to the peasants who dwelt around him in an effort to find out what gave meaning to their lives. It became clear to him, as a result of this inquiry, that the only thing which made life endurable for the peasants was their faith in God. With new hope springing from this discovery, Tolstoy now launched into a thorough study of the Bible, reading editions in every language he knew, including the original Greek text of the *New Testament*, the *Vulgate*, and versions in many modern languages. As an aid to his Bible studies, he even plunged into the study of Hebrew in much the same spectacular way in which he had studied Greek and with equally remarkable results.²⁹ The conclusion he eventually reached was that the answer to his question was to be found in the teachings of Jesus, but not as those teachings were interpreted by the Orthodox Church.

In an effort to support and clarify his stand, Tolstoy published a number of works on religion in the ensuing years. One, entitled *Criticism of Dogmatic Theology*,³⁰ attempted to refute many of the dogmas of the Orthodox Church. In another work, entitled *In What Does My Faith Consist?*, he attempts, on the basis of analyses of the Greek texts, to establish new interpretations of various passages in the *New Testament*.³¹ Another work, called *A Short Exposition of the Gospel*, presents in one continuous narrative the accounts of the four Gospels in Tolstoy's own translation of the Greek texts.³² As a result of these activities, Tolstoy was excommunicated from the Orthodox Church. Many of his fellow countrymen, however, accepted his views, and before

long a new sect had been organized under the name of Tolstoites.

In the period when the Tolstoites were flourishing, Tolstoy, in addition to being interested in the *Bible*, also devoted considerable attention to the works of Seneca, Epicuretus, and Marcus Aurelius. He apparently made it a practice to read their works aloud in his home, since his wife notes in her diary, under the date of October 2, 1897, that she loves her husband for that world of philosophy to which he introduced her by reading to her the works of these three writers and others.³³

Around 1890, as Tolstoy continued his philosophical studies, he became convinced that it was sinful to use tobacco, drink alcoholic beverages, or consume animal flesh; and at once set about trying to convert his fellow countrymen to his point of view. In this endeavor, as in many others, he sought help from the classics. His chief publication on the subject is a work entitled *The First Step*, written in 1892.³⁴ The argument presented in this work, reduced to its simplest terms, is as follows: the Greeks maintained that restraint and self-control are essential to a good life, as is proved by Socrates' use of the terms *ἐγκράτεια* and *σωφροσύνη*; abstinence from meat, alcohol, and tobacco is an ideal example of restraint and self-control; therefore abstinence from meat, alcohol, and tobacco is essential to a good life. The fact that there is abundant evidence that the Greeks of antiquity consumed both wine and meat in substantial quantities seems to have caused Tolstoy no concern whatever.

In view of Tolstoy's personal enthusiasm for the classics, one might expect that he would be an ardent supporter of the claim of the classical languages to an important place in the school curriculum. But such was not the case. In fact, his works are full of references indicating that his position was just the opposite. For a considerable period of time in the 1860's Tolstoy was so deeply concerned with problems of education that he devoted practically all of his energies to this one matter.³⁵ His activities in this sphere

include extensive tours for the study of school systems in Western Europe, the establishment of several private schools, publication of a series of textbooks, publication of a pedagogical journal, and production of a large number of articles on the subject. In an article entitled "On National Education," Tolstoy reports that, as he visited schools in France and questioned French school children with a view to finding out what they knew about history, he was somewhat shocked at being told by one youngster that Henry IV had been killed by Julius Caesar.³⁶ Later, however, he was equally amazed at learning that this same boy was thoroughly familiar with the story of *The Four Musketiers* and the story of *Monte Cristo*. In his opinion, the explanation for the typical Frenchman's familiarity with the literature of his country was to be found in the fact that many cheap editions of literary works were everywhere available, and there were many museums, libraries, theaters, and other institutions in which, for payment of a small sum, the Frenchman could see good plays and hear poetry recited. This system, which, in his opinion, was simply a duplication of the system employed by the Greeks and Romans in their amphitheaters, was considered by him a very effective means of education.³⁷ Presumably, in making this observation, Tolstoy had in mind primarily the dramatic productions of the Greeks.

But, in spite of his admiration of Greek and Roman methods of education, Tolstoy had little admiration for Greek and Latin as subjects in the curriculum. In an article entitled "Training and Education," he remarks: "Regardless of how many scholars known the world over and regardless of how many persons of outstanding character claim that the development of an individual is brought about most effectively by the study of Latin grammar and Greek and Latin poems in the original, even though it is possible to read them in translation—I shall not believe it any more than I believe that for proper development it is necessary for a person to stand on one leg for three hours."³⁸ In the same article Tolstoy, complaining about the

reluctance of many to accept his advanced ideas on education, explains that he often hears the query: "But, if there will be no *gymnasium* and no Latin, what shall I do?" His answer, from the point of view of the classicist, is perhaps a little too optimistic, as he exclaims: "Don't fear! There will be Latin and there will be rhetoric. They will exist for a hundred years, and they will exist only for the reason that, as a sick man once said to me, 'The medicine has been bought; so it must be taken'."³⁹ These comments, to be sure, were made in the earlier stages of Tolstoy's career, but his later works show no change of attitude. In 1884 he wrote: "... It is not enough to bring a person up, feed him, and teach him Greek; it is necessary to teach him to live. . . ."⁴⁰ And a little later, in his article "On the Meaning of Science and Art," he writes: "... We teach our children Greeek and Latin grammar so they can continue that same life of parasites which we ourselves lead."⁴¹ Perhaps his sharpest remark of all in this connection is to be found in the earlier mentioned work, *In What Does My Faith Consist?* In this work Tolstoy provides a list of commandments for the spiritual guidance of his followers. These may be summarized briefly as follows: don't go to war to kill Turks and Germans; don't take the possessions of the poor from them by force; don't imprison people on petty charges; don't live in the foul air of cities; and don't teach children the grammar of dead languages before and in preference to all else.⁴² Even with the qualification which is added, this last command seems very strange, coming as it does at the end of a long work in which the author has employed all sorts of elaborate analyses of Greek texts in an effort to justify his personal interpretations of the *New Testament*.

It is very difficult to account for the inconsistency between Tolstoy's personal enthusiasm for the classics and his hostility towards the classical languages as school subjects. In fairness to him, it should be noted that in many of his caustic utterances on the subject the word "grammar" occupies a conspicuous position. His objections are

unquestionably based in part on a tendency prevalent in many schools to overemphasize the grammatical phases of linguistic study. It is just possible, too, that some of his utterances are designed to shock his readers rather than to express his true sentiments. Some credence is lent to this last suggestion by the fact that in 1878, as noted by Countess Tolstoy in her diary,⁴³ a tutor was brought to the Tolstoy household at frequent intervals to give the oldest son lessons in Greek and Latin.

In his book, *On Lyev Tolstoy and the Tolstoites*, A. S. Prugavin gives a vivid picture of how in his last years Tolstoy, after giving away his personal possessions, wandered over the country with his followers in self-imposed poverty, attempting to demonstrate the validity of the principles of his creed. A letter by one of the Tolstoites, Syeryezha Popov, included in this volume explains how the writer and Tolstoy went about trying to get their views on the brotherhood of man accepted. It was their contention that, since all men are brothers, there is no need for personal names or passports. Hence, when they were questioned about their identity, they always staunchly refused to tell their names or present their passports. In one locality officials, after vainly trying to secure their passports, placed them under arrest. When they were searched, some evidence was brought to light which indicated that, even in this trying period, Tolstoy had not lost his interest in the classics. One of the few possessions on Tolstoy at the time, according to the writer of the letter, was a book on the lives of the wise men of Greece.⁴⁴

CHAUNCEY E. FINCH

Saint Louis University

NOTES

¹ This is a slightly revised version of a paper read at the 1951 convention of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South held at Memphis, Tennessee, March 29-31.

² P. Birukov, *Lyev Nikolayevich Tolstoy, Biografiya* (Moscow, 1911-1913), Vol. 1, p. 27.

(Concluded on page 251)

The Psychiatric Cases in Horace, *Satires* 2.3

(Read before the American Philological Association, Baltimore, 1949.)

THE FATHER OF THE POET HORACE WAS, from his son's account (*Sat.* 1.4.105-116), an excellent student of what we now call individual psychology.¹ He recognized character patterns in those about him and pointed out to his son which were to be copied, which avoided. When Horace as a student was introduced to the Stoic teaching that all men except adherents of their own philosophy are mad, this doctrine appeared to him as a worthy subject for ridicule (*Sat.* 1.1.120f, 1.3.140, *Epist.* 1.12.20).

The theme had been treated by Cicero as a medium for satirizing the faults of his contemporaries (*Parad.* 4). The *Characters* of Theophrastus, which deals with types of individuals noteworthy for their idiosyncracies, was a classic in the schools of Horace's time, as throughout antiquity.² M. Terentius Varro had composed one of his Menippean *Satires*, called *Eumenides*, which is no longer extant, on the Stoic paradox.³ There is no evidence from the existing fragments of Lucilius⁴ that he had discussed the topic, although Porphyry in his note on Horace *Satires* 2.3.41 implies that he had written such a work.

Horace may have been considering the theme of the third *Satire* of the second book and collecting examples to illustrate it over a period of time. The composition was completed after 33 B.C.,⁵ but before Horace had become the poet who glorified the peace of the rule of Augustus. A time of social and political unrest, like that of Horace's youth, gives an opportunity for reformers, such as the Stoic philosophers, to be listened to. The Stoic diatribe abounded in homely wisdom, well-known examples from mythology and literature, fables, rhetorical questions, direct admonitions to the listeners to secure attention, and references to recent news events

that would strike a familiar note in the mind of the audience.

The diatribe which Horace pretends to quote is ascribed to a certain Stertinius, who is not known to us except for Horace's references to him in this *Satire* and in *Epistles* 1.12.20 and the note of a scholiast on the latter passage.⁶ The wisdom of Stertinius is quoted for Horace's benefit by one Damasippus, who is mentioned in Cicero's *Letters*. The first reference (*Fam.* 7.23.2, 3) shows that he was dealing in antiques at the time; by 43 B.C. (*Att.* 12.29.2, 12.33.1) he was also handling choice real estate, an even more expensive commodity. Obviously, his business collapsed after the proscriptions of the Second Triumvirate, when confiscated estates and works of art were a glut on the market, since buyers of such items had been killed or were themselves penniless. Damasippus, overwhelmed with shame that his life was a failure, was about to throw himself into the Tiber. At this moment the philosopher appeared, convinced him that his sense of defeat was groundless, since all men with the exception of the Stoics are equally mad, and cured him of his psychosis, admirably and at much less expense than is usual for such treatment.⁷

A similar conversion was recorded in the history of ancient philosophy and is mentioned later in the *Satire* (254-257) in connection with the discussion of flaming youth. Philemon, the Athenian, on the way home from carousing, entered the lecture room of Xenocrates in a spirit of fun. He was, however, so impressed by the professor's discourse that then and there he renounced his life of self-indulgence and eventually himself became the head of the Old Academy. Similarly, some fourteen hundred years after Polemon, Giovanni Bernardone, the dandy of Assisi,

became Saint Francis. These men furnish examples of individuals of high intelligence who deliberately changed the course of their lives after self-evaluation.⁸

The converted Damasippus grew a beard, the insignia of the philosopher, and went forth to promulgate the teachings of his master. He even pursued Horace, as a likely subject for reform, to his Sabine Farm, where he found the poet at peace with the world (5). Bursting in, he accused him of a host of neuroses (7f): he is indolent; he rationalizes his slowness in composition by blaming his writing materials; he beats the walls in his temper.⁹ To cure all this, the intruder proceeds with the diatribe. He discusses four types of abnormality: the avaricious, the ambitious, the self-indulgent, including the amorous and the luxury loving, and finally the superstitious.¹⁰

The legendary examples of madness which are used by the author of the diatribe to illustrate his thesis were standard with the philosophers. Orestes is judged a case of temporary insanity (132-141). After he had avenged his father's betrayal and death by the murder of his mother, Clytemnestra, his conduct was above criticism. Agamemnon's sacrifice of his daughter, Iphigenia, is cited as hardly the act of a rational person (199-220). The Stoics considered it a case of megalomania due to ambition. Lucretius, it will be recalled, had condemned the king as a victim of superstitious fear (1.84-101). The madness of Ajax (187-198) was well known not only from the tragedy of Sophocles but also from several Latin plays now lost.¹¹ As a compensation for his frustration at losing the award of the arms of Achilles, Ajax slaughtered sheep which in his delusion he identified as his rivals. Agave was the outstanding ancient instance of delusion brought on by religious fervor (303f).

Another stock Stoic example of questionable sanity was the Cyrenaic Aristippus (100-102), who was reported to have thrown away his valuables when they were a hindrance on a journey through the desert, putting the convenience of the moment ahead of ultimate values. Conversely, in their

consideration of extremes only, the Stoics regarded all collectors as mad (104-108), with no concern for the fact that collecting is a normal human instinct and, when pursued within limits, an adjunct to a well-adjusted personality.

Besides mythological characters and references to types used by his Roman predecessors, such as Nomentanus the spendthrift (175, 224),¹² the subjects of many of the literary vignettes of which the Satire is composed are probably from bits of gossip current at the time. As a parallel to the lunatic who refuses to listen to reason, an anecdote is told about a drunken actor, Fufius (60-62). He fell into a sound slumber while portraying a sleeping character and failed to hear his cue until the entire audience roared the line. This story sounds too much like a popular joke to be dismissed as an invention of Horace. Similarly, many of the illustrations cited in other connections may have been based on contemporary instances familiar to his readers.

Horace states, as if from the folk wisdom heard during his childhood in south Italy, the principle, now generally accepted,¹³ that character patterns are well established at an early age. Servius Oppidius is given as the name of a sage of Canusium who had noted the dispositions of his two sons, one generous, one niggardly, from boyhood. He accordingly admonished them on his deathbed, forbidding the one to squander, the other to increase, his patrimony (168-186). The maladjusted urchin who wants what he cannot have and refuses what is offered him (258f) is compared to the foolish lover who weeps when rejected by the object of his affection, but hesitates when she summons him back (259-264). The lover's dilemma (262-271), which is paraphrased from Terence (*Eun.* 46-58), was certainly familiar to Horace's readers. A foolish lover is like one who plays children's games when a grown man (247-249). Could this comparison have been suggested by some instance of senile dementia?

Among spoiled children who had become a byword in Rome was the son of Aesopus (239-242), the successful actor of Cicero's

time (*Fam.* 7.1.2, *Plin. HN* 10.141). This youth figured in one form of the legend of a priceless drink made of a pearl dissolved in vinegar (*Plin. HN* 9.122). The millionaire *Arrius* (86), himself renowned for the displays which he gave in the circus (*Cic. In Vat.* 30), had two sons who were notorious spendthrifts. They dined on nightingales for a new taste thrill (243-245). Such young men were rightly judged by the Stoics, or by Horace's own verdict, as having no greater sense of real values than if they had given their wealth outright to those who catered to their pleasures (226-238). They had no more left in the end than if they had just thrown their inheritances down the drain (241f). These spoiled and self-indulgent youths merely wasted their own patrimony. The frustrated lover may go further in crime against society, as did a certain *Marius*. He slew his inamorata, *Hellas*, a freedwoman, in a fit of jealousy and then killed himself (276-278). With names changed, the story might be a current news dispatch.

The *gens Meneni* referred to by Horace (287) is otherwise unknown. It may be that more than one member of this family had been obviously mad, without leaving any reference in history as to the details of their derangement. In a single line near the beginning of the Satire (30) Horace depicts the man in a stupor who suddenly becomes violent. Though this detail is introduced merely in order to cause a laugh at the expense of *Damasippus*—Horace implores him not to develop into this type of maniac—it is a true picture of the catatonic type of schizophrenia. In some cases also the victim of a blow on the head resulting in internal injury may remain in a stupor for a time and then suddenly become violent. Horace may have known such a case from his experiences after *Philippi* or from the circumstances of the death of some popular athlete, since athletes, particularly boxers, are apt to succumb to such injuries.

Many of the stories which the so-called *Stertinius* recounts concern persons of rather advanced age.¹⁴ The old men who seek security in accumulated wealth furnish material

for about a third of the quoted diatribe (84-157). This type was proverbial, but Horace's picture of the man who prefers to die of starvation rather than pay eight asses for a bowl of rice gruel (142-157) has Roman details which seem to have been taken from actual cases of misers whose only object in life was to preserve their wealth. Horace alludes also to the old man who, in his parsimony, allows himself to become untidy (125f).¹⁵ Theophrastus had depicted the type of the filthy old man in unpleasant detail (*Char.* 19).

As a foil to *Agamemnon's* sacrifice of his daughter as a lamb, Horace describes another form of neurotic tendency, the extreme devotion to pets (214-218), a characteristic of persons who have been bereft of other outlets for their affections. Such devotion to animals—now dogs or cats rather than lambs—as even to provide for them extravagantly by will appears from time to time in our own probate courts.

Horace's examples of the superstitious as types of the deranged were taken from among the underprivileged of Roman society, whom Horace had encountered in his rambles about the slums (*Sat.* 1.6.111-114). The old man who had once been a slave and, though now freed, hopes for some compensation for his trials implores the gods, whom he worships punctiliously, to make him alone of all men immortal (281-286). The other victim of superstitious mania (288-295) is the only woman considered in the Satire, aside from the mythical *Agave*. This circumstance is noteworthy, since cases of insanity occur in about equal numbers among men and women. The superstitious mother bargains with the gods that if her child recovers from his fever, she will have him take a ritual bath standing naked in the Tiber. It is implied that the unfortunate boy died of exposure as the result of this treatment.

Whatever his main purpose in publishing this Satire, whether it was a defense of his meager literary output or merely an opportunity to deride the Stoic preachers, Horace, while admitting that he himself is not without faults, is presented to us as a kindly

observer of human weaknesses in contrast to the fanatic Stoic who condemns all that are not like himself. Horace has differentiated the harmless eccentric and the unstable youth from the victim of deeply rooted personality disorders which are recognized as madness in any society. One basis for confining an individual as insane is that he will do harm to others or to himself, will refuse to help himself or deliberately suffer from lack of needed treatment.¹⁶ In this group belong the murderer, whether from love or avarice, the miser who neglects himself, those who sacrifice others or reduce themselves to beggary because of ambition, those who cause injury by fulfilling ill-considered vows, those who are so absorbed in themselves as to be blind to the workings of nature, those who transfer human affection to extravagant care for animals, and those who withdraw into a state of helpless infantilism.

Horace's vivid descriptions of these psychoses seem to stem from personal knowledge or from reports of deranged individuals among his contemporaries. The period in which his youth was passed had been marked by one of the gravest successions of wars, revolutions, and economic fluctuations known to history. Many Romans of less stable temperament must have cracked under the strain, since a sense of insecurity plays a large part in causing mental abnormalities not arising from organic causes.¹⁷

ERNESTINE F. LEON

The University of Texas

NOTES

¹ W. Béran Wolfe in Introductory Essay to Alfred Adler, *The Pattern of Life* (New York, 1930) 7.

² G. S. Gordon, *Theophrastus and His Imitators in English Literature and the Classics* (Oxford, 1912) 54.

³ M. Terenti Varronis *Saturarum Menippearum Reliquiae*, ed. Alexander Riese (Leipzig, 1865) 124-135.

⁴ The four occurrences of the word *insanus* in the fragments are not conclusive.

⁵ Verse 185 apparently refers to the shows given by Agrippa in that year.

⁶ Pseudo-Acro in his note on *Epist.* 1.12.20 states that he was the author of one hundred twenty books on philosophy.

⁷ The only other cure for mental ailments suggested in the *Satire* (82, 166) is the drug hellebore. Expressions like "He needs hellebore" or "He should sail to Anticyra" had become proverbial for "He is insane." The black hellebore of Anticyra is a violent purgative and heart stimulant and is no longer used in medicine except for domestic animals. See Friedrich A. Flückiger and Daniel Hanbury, *Pharmacographia. A History of the Principal Drugs of Vegetable Origin Met With in Great Britain and British India* (London, 1874) 3. The white hellebore is an emetic and heart depressant, now used as an ointment in veterinary medicine. *Ibid.* 632.

⁸ Wolfe, *op. cit.* (above, note 1) 20.

⁹ The scholiasts, in comments on verse 8, have invented the rather incredible explanation that poets used the walls as blackboards to jot down inspirations which came at night or when writing materials were not at hand. Kiessling's note that Horace curses the walls because they close him within the confines of a room during the winter months when he cannot meditate in the open country seems equally far-fetched.

¹⁰ These types continued to hold the attention of later philosophers. Avarice, ambition, greed, and lust are four of the seven capital sins of the medieval church fathers; *Cath. Enc.* 14.5; cf. L. A. McKay's note on *Epist.* 1.1.38 in *CPh* 37 (1942) 80.

¹¹ Otto Ribbeck, *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*² (Leipzig, 1871) cites an *Aiax Mastigophoros* by Livius Andronicus, an *Aiax* by Ennius, and an *Amorium iudicium* by both Pacuvius and Accius.

¹² Nomentanus is used for the spendthrift type also in *Sat.* 1.1.102, 1.8.11, 2.1.22. The name may go back to Lucilius, if Lachmann and others are right in reading it in his fragments, although Marx reads otherwise (Lachmann 69 = Marx 56). Some find the name also in Marx 69 (= Lachmann 57); see F. Münzer in *RE*, s.v. Nomentanus.

¹³ Wolfe, *op. cit.* (above, note 1) 19.

¹⁴ On the greater susceptibility of persons over forty to mental illness see Percival M. Symonds, *Psychological Diagnosis in Social Adjustment* (New York, 1934) 75.

¹⁵ There is another reference to the untidy old man in *Sat.* 1.1.96f.

¹⁶ Cf. Symonds, *op. cit.* (above, note 14) 54.

¹⁷ Wolfe, *op. cit.* (above, note 1) 9.

Dramatic Art in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*

(Read at the Foreign Language Conference, University of Kentucky, May, 1950.)

DRAMA IS A TWO-HEADED CREATURE. A play is both literature, and a text for a theatrical action. Only the supreme dramatists have made a perfect union of the two. Tennyson and Browning wrote literary dramas that would not act at all; the libretti of most operas have no literary merit whatever.

As literature, a play may appeal through its poetry or style, or through the seriousness of its theme or its religious and social ideas. As a dramatic text, a play succeeds in proportion as it is adapted to actual pantomime on a stage, as words and actions combine to form a lively whole. A play, then, may be judged by its literary merits and intellectual content; or it may be judged by the sense of "theatre" there is in it.

If I read the critics aright, Aeschylus is commonly judged as a literary man or as a preacher. His style and his thought are mostly stressed. To my mind he was one of the elect who both wrote great dramatic poems with prophetic utterance in them, and at the same time had a superb sense of theater. Many who deal with his dramatic technique appear to regard him as an apprentice. Of course he was not as smooth in design as Sophocles or as crafty as Euripides; yet it is absurd to think of his plays as merely earnest religious pageants, archaic in manner and meagre in theatricality. In his sense of theatre, he ranks close to Plautus and Shakespeare.

The *Agamemnon* has a great many ingredients of exciting drama. It has a real-life situation: guilty wife, nursing an old grudge, confronts returning husband and rival, and murders them. There is a theme packed with down-to-earth thrills. The action is rapid and condensed; every incident is relevant. The play mounts vigorously to a climax, and ends in a grimly comic scene where the wife and

her feeble paramour are left in command. It includes a quaint watchman who introduces us to the action in whimsical terms. It has a mad-scene of terrific power, where the prophetess Cassandra passes from a speechless hysteria to lucidity, and relapses again into maniac incoherence. It affords a vivid contrast between the resolute Clytemnestra, harshly portrayed with unsparing candour, and the stupid and confused Agamemnon. It shows an agonizing conflict of stresses in Clytemnestra—guilt, resentment, and an urge to play the role of Avenging Angel. Such materials could make first-rate melodrama or soap-opera. Aeschylus handled them with dignity, but with devastating theatrical effect.

Two outstanding features of Aeschylus' dramatic engineering will be discussed here: (1) his use of an opening scene that immediately enlists our sympathies and ushers us into the heart of the action, so that it matters tremendously to us how that action is to turn out; (2) a continuous and high-pitched excitement, produced through a character whose temper and mood are brought out as living things. Such quick fellow-feeling between us and a leading character is what chiefly makes a play stirring. Religious, moral and sociological problems may be involved too, and they are important. But what gives drama life is our vivid experience of a character whose every mood, every hope, every fear we can share by instant sympathy.

(1) Prologue

Earlier dramatists usually have trouble beginning a play, especially with giving the audience the explanation it needs to understand the action. A tempting device is simply to put the tedious exposition into the mouth of a prologist, who makes explanations directly

to the audience. In modern times, a printed bill does the same duty. When Aeschylus began to write, it would seem that experiments were already well advanced in making subtle variations upon these expository-prologue scenes. Anyway, neither Aeschylus nor Sophocles uses a "straight" prologue. The prologists of the *Suppliants* and the *Prometheus* are no mere reciters of facts; they *do* something to get the action moving, they are themselves involved in the action, and they take us with them straight into the heart of it.

The prologue of the *Agamemnon* is delivered by a watchman, posted to pick up the signal of beacon-fires that will tell of the capture of Troy. His speech is no catalogue. It opens up a situation that is desperate for him, and (before he has spoken many words) for us too. The watchman is emotionally involved in the action. In order to involve us as well, he must be made to draw us to him. How does he contrive to make us feel that we are with him and willing to see the situation through his eyes?

An audience can be counted on to go with a character of naive and homely simplicity. Such a man, we feel, has a reliably direct and common-sense view of things. Aeschylus' watchman is the fore-runner in dramatic literature of a long series of servants, nurses, porters, country store-keepers, negro mamies, etc.—they typically speak in dialect, by the way—whose artless honesty make them inevitably spokesmen for ourselves.

With a few simple touches, Aeschylus builds up the watchman as just such a winsome character. His rueful description of his boredom on a tedious watch, his mention of the ditties he trolls to beguile his boredom, his homely phrases and proverbs, his covert hostility to Clytemnestra—conveyed to us with what amounts to a wink and a long face—all these instantly win us to him as to a man of clean and guileless spirit. Now, what he has to say about the situation in the palace of Agamemnon will determine our sympathies. He drops hint after hint of what is going on in the "big house." We not only pick up the facts, but we enter into the situa-

tion under the watchman's tutelage. He tells us of the long suspense, of the crisis that the appearance of the beacon will make, of the fear he has about the outcome. He puts us against Clytemnestra, the "masculine-minded" queen. He speaks of his love and sympathy for Agamemnon, so that we instinctively take sides with him. In fact, this brief prologue has been so subtly designed that it is as good as a rapid first act. The basic situation of the play has been unfolded—not merely presented factually, but developed in such a way that there has been full imaginative and emotional participation by the audience. The dramatist who contrived such a scene was far from being a hesitant and ineffective beginner.

(2) *The Portrayal of Clytemnestra*

The *Agamemnon* might well have been entitled the *Clytemnestra*. The dramatic situation arises almost entirely from her character. Our attention is riveted on her from beginning to end. The play is a study of her temperament, of the way she faces the nerve-wracking ordeal of greeting her returning husband, a man whom she hates and whom she has wronged by living adulterously while he has been away. She must nerve herself to carry out his murder, as she has long planned. Such is the central situation. There are three stresses in Clytemnestra's mind: (a) her own sense of guilt, aggravated by the knowledge that her people are hostile to her; (b) the necessity, for the sake of good manners and for avoiding suspicion, to meet Agamemnon on his return and put up a show of royal welcome; (c) her bitter resentment against Agamemnon because he had put to death their daughter Iphigeneia, a resentment probably genuine enough but not without its ironic overtones: she harps on it so much we begin to suspect her of using it to strengthen her own guilty resolution.

The combination of these three stresses—her guilt, her dread of the ordeal of offering a plausible welcome to Agamemnon and her hatred of him—make up a conflict remarkably complex in comparison with those in most Greek tragedies. Aeschylus proves his mas-

tery of dramatic technique in the interplay of these stresses, and by a brilliant delineation of a person torn between agonizing strains. He combines in Clytemnestra the Guilty Wife, the Correct Queen, the Grim Avenger. She is always convincing in her behaviour. She is drawn with superb force and psychological truth.

The figure of Clytemnestra is in the forefront from beginning to end. Within a few lines of the opening, the watchman refers to the masterful, resolute disposition of his queen, and we are prepared to find her a formidable personage. After thus establishing her as the centre of interest in the play, he goes on to speak of the state of terror in the house and the evil times on which it has fallen. His joy at the sudden signal of Troy's fall and at the impending return of his master is tempered by an equally sudden misgiving; he wants to extend a friendly hand to his master, but he sees that his return is beset with terrors which he can only hint at. The royal house is tortured with foreboding, and this foreboding centres in the person of the Queen.

During the first chorus Clytemnestra appears, probably in a dumb-show or pantomime, kindling fires on all the altars of the gods, in celebration of the news of Troy's fall. Here is Clytemnestra the Queen, in her official royal role—an ironical one, to be sure—making public acknowledgment of the king's triumph. The chorus mingles its relief at the good news with anxiety; it asks Clytemnestra to relieve its wavering doubts, so far as he can or may tell what is in her mind. The chorus then immediately reverts to the thought of Iphigeneia's death, with a dark commentary on the theme of Clytemnestra the Outraged Mother.

When Clytemnestra reappears at the end of the chorus, two words are used in addressing her that are singularly appropriate. The chorus professes reverence for her *κράτος*—her power, mastery; the very next word used is *δική*—justice, right. It is almost as if the dramatist were underlining his principal themes, the grimness and harsh strength of Clytemnestra, together with the vengeance

she hopes to wreak for her murdered child, and the sense of fitness that impels her now to put on a show of welcome to the conquering hero.

In the dialogue between her and the chorus, her exasperation bespeaks an unbearable inner tension. Clytemnestra is testy with the chorus for not immediately grasping the purport of her words. Her answers to further queries are abrupt and rude. She asks the chorus if they take her for a little girl carried away by some impetuous hope. The irony of that is surely grim. Her famous Beacon Speech is purple patch, but a psychologically sound one. It is organic. Though it is high-flown oratory, it is eminently appropriate here, because at a moment of unbearable excitement the excitement has to come out some way. Shakespeare and Aeschylus both know the value of vivid, highly-coloured rhetoric, exactly timed. It is the inevitable escape of emotion, when the real reason for the excitement cannot be explained.

Clytemnestra's next speech is equally revealing. With something amounting to clairvoyance she reconstructs the scenes of victory at Troy and the final release of her countrymen from the horror of war. She dwells with foreboding on the possible guilt of impiety in the Greek victors; she doubtless wishes that they were guilty; she needs all the moral support she can get for her role as Avenger. Perhaps she is grimly suggesting that she does not want the gods to punish Agamemnon before she has a chance to do so herself. Towards the end of her speech she makes a dark reference to Iphigeneia's death as if in further self-justification, and as if she were screwing her courage to the sticking point.

After the herald has reported the taking of Troy and the imminent return of Agamemnon, Clytemnestra continues to show mounting tension. She makes a sarcastic gibe at the chorus for its incredulity and flings its words back in its teeth. She "protests too much" in proclaiming her joy at her husband's return, and so reveals all the more her inward *malaise*. She professes eagerness to welcome him, and relief at having him spared

to her. She stresses her loyalty to him during his absence, and in particular her marital fidelity. Nothing could show more clearly her sense of guilt than these protestations of pure innocence. It was no bungling dramatist that put such lines into her mouth. She is so obviously the guilty wife here, so abjectly conscious of her guilt that she becomes pitiable for the moment. In her distress she comes near to commanding sympathy.

She appears next after Agamemnon's entry and opening speech. This time she starts by being coy. She is not ashamed, she says, to show her eagerness to greet her lord: once again, the Guilty Wife, putting on as plausible a show as she can. Instantly again she is on the defensive. She tries to show how women left at home in wartime suffer no less than the soldiers. This is a bid for ascendancy. She must feel, before the returning hero her husband, a little cheap at her behaviour during his absence. Any build-up for herself will do. She makes a vivid picture of the heart-breaking anxieties she professes to have suffered while Agamemnon was away.

Her craft and her sense of guilt come out again in her gratuitous explanation—or pretext—for Orestes' absence. All the scenes between her and her husband are a series of manoeuvres for moral advantage. Clytemnestra is quick to anticipate any question about her stewardship, but with every defensive plea she discloses the torment of guilt in herself, and the struggle she is having to go through with her design of murder. She is lashing herself to the awful enterprise. The plausibility and falsity of her protestations, her very eagerness to offer unsought explanations, the exaggeration of her appeals for sympathy—all these depict clearly her intense inner turmoil.

The final round in the struggle for moral ascendancy comes in the "carpet-scene." Aeschylus was shrewd in having the climax in a simple and concrete situation. It comes with all the more vividness and force. So far, Clytemnestra has for the most part tried to put herself in the right. Now she tries to put Agamemnon in the wrong. She chooses

a picturesque way to do it. She tempts him to walk a purple carpet from his chariot into the palace. If he does so, he will have done an act of arrogance, deserving of nemesis. He pretends to demur. By an adroit appeal to his vanity she persuades him to it, and he strides thus into the house (not without misgiving) and to his destruction. A burst of eloquence from Clytemnestra shows some breaking of the tension in her, as if the preliminary embarrassments were over, and as if she were now nerved to the supreme ordeal.

Now the Guilty Wife meets a new situation. The captive Trojan girl, Cassandra, has been waiting silent on stage all this time. Clytemnestra speaks to her graciously enough. She will, of course, (Clytemnestra tells her) be a slave; let there be no mistake about that; but she is lucky to fall in with real gentlefolk instead of upstarts. But the Queen's composure soon cracks, when the terrified girl cannot or will not follow her remarks. She flounces from the stage, and tells the chorus to use force on the girl, if words fail. Through this scene, Clytemnestra's thoughts are elsewhere. She deals with Cassandra perfunctorily. The murder of her husband is impending. Dealing with his concubine is only a distracting and irritating incident.

The murder is done. We wait to see how Clytemnestra will appear. Shattered by remorse? Hysterical? Exhausted and incapable of play-acting any longer? Not she! She comes forth with superb assurance. She is ready to stand by her deed. Her tremendous effrontery from here to the end of the play, her almost entire self-control, are magnificent, in spite of the horror they arouse. She is a truly splendid figure. We cannot sympathize; we are forced to admire, even to feel awe for a resolution so consistent and a strength of purpose so unwavering. Her own words as she stands over her husband's corpse are the best commentary:

This is the sum and issue of old strife,
Of me deep-pondered and at length fulfilled.
All is avowed, and as I smote I stand
With foot set firm upon a finished thing. . . .

(Concluded on page 251)

The Problem of the Second Burial in Sophocles' *Antigone*

(Read before CAMWS, Southern Section, Tallahassee, Florida, 1949.)

THE SECOND BURIAL that Antigone performs for her brother, Polynices, is called a problem, because its action within the drama seems to be unmotivated. Tycho von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, the son of the great Wilamowitz, states the problem in this manner: "for the second visit of Antigone not the least explanation or motivation is given. The first time she had, as is expressly said, buried the corpse with all due religious rites and observances (*volkommen rite*), and no one in the play expects a second visit of the perpetrator of the burial or regards it as even possible."¹

The fact is that dramatic propriety demands the second burial. A short summary of the action of the play down to the point where Antigone is brought before Creon by the Guard and confesses the deed will suffice to make this clear:

It is early morning. On the day before the brothers, Polynices and Eteocles, had killed each other in single combat and the Argive army had been driven away from Thebes. Antigone summons her sister, Ismene, beyond the gates of the court and informs her that Creon, their uncle and the present king of the land, has just published a decree, which requires that Eteocles, the protector of his country, be buried honorably, but that Polynices, the enemy of his country, be denied honorable burial. And whoever defies this edict will suffer death by stoning. Antigone is determined to bury her brother, and asks Ismene to help her. When the latter refuses to assist, Antigone departs to do the deed alone.

The fifteen Theban elders composing the Chorus enter, and in a very beautiful ode greet the rising sun, expressing thanks for deliverance from the danger of the Argive host and Polynices. They have been sum-

moned by Creon, who now appears and makes known the contents of the decree. At this moment the Guard hastens in with the news that someone has already performed symbolic burial rites for Polynices by covering the body with dust. Creon closely questions the man and sends him away with dire threats of what will happen to him and the other guards, unless the culprit is produced. After a fine choral song on the bold inventiveness and resourcefulness of man, the Guard leads in Antigone as a prisoner and reports how she was taken in the act of burying her brother.

From this brief summary it is obvious that the poet has so handled and ordered the action of the play that the second burial is dramatically necessary. There must be no doubt about the guilt of Antigone. She must be caught actually giving burial to Polynices. The real difficulty, however, is that she has already satisfied the demands of the dead.² Her duty has been done. The Guard can remove the dust, but he cannot make the corpse unburied. Yet Antigone, when she sees that the dust has been removed, with a cry of pain³ sprinkles it again. Professor Jebb takes note of this inconsistency: "A difficulty presents itself. The essence of the symbolical rite was the sprinkling of dust. She had done that (245). Was it not, then, done once for all? In Horace (C.1.28.35) the passer-by is free when the dust has been thrown; he can go his way. I have never seen this question put or answered. The only answer that I can suggest is that, at her first visit, she had not brought the *Xoai*. Perhaps the rite was considered complete only if the *Xoai* were poured while the dust still covered the corpse."⁴ Jebb's suggestion that the rite of burial was complete only if the *Xoai* were poured while the dust still covered the corpse

is not impressive. Humphreys' note on verse 431 of his edition of Sophocles' *Antigone* is more sensible. He says that the first burial was complete (and so does virtually everyone else) and suggests, but does not say, that the *Xoai* were brought to a kinsman's tomb just as in our time flowers are taken to a loved one's grave. Jebb no doubt thought that Sophocles did not provide a good and sufficient reason for Antigone's return to the scene of the burial, that the bringing of the *Xoai* was a lame excuse for her presence there, and that it was contrived for the purpose of effecting her capture while in the act of sepulture.

The Greek dramatists were most attentive to this matter of motivation.⁵ They took care that whatever event occurred in a play was preceded by a subtle reference to it, in order to prepare the mind of the audience and lessen the shock of surprise. The fact that the second burial does not appear to be motivated is all the more striking because it leads to a most important result, the capture of Antigone. Now if anyone ever wrote with his eye on the stage, it was Sophocles. Past master of the dramatic art that he was, he gave such close attention to the development of the plot and other details of the drama that he would not have failed to provide in the words and actions of the play itself a sufficient motivation for any act or incident within the drama. Therefore, had he thought that our play, *Antigone*, did not supply within itself a good enough reason for her return a second time to the place where the body of her brother lay, he would have devised some better way to bring about her arrest. Since he has seen fit not to do so, we must conclude that the second burial did not seem strange to the Greek audience, and we must make an effort to account for its motivation.

Gilbert Norwood expresses his opinion on the difficulty under consideration. He agrees with Hegel that Antigone and Creon were both right and both wrong,⁶ and he thinks that the second burial wins support for such an interpretation of the play. Professor Norwood believes that Antigone buried Poly-

nices twice, because in this way she can express her wilfulness, which creates a sort of vicious circle and brings tragedy upon everyone in the drama; for he claims that "her obstinacy brings about the punishment of Creon's obstinacy, for Eurydice's death is caused by Haemon's and Haemon's by Antigone's. Had she not intervened, all these lives would have been saved. The whole action might have dwindled to a mere revolting incident: the king's barbarity, the anger of the gods, and the king's submission. The tragedy (as we know it) would have disappeared; it is Antigone's splendid though perverse valour which creates the drama."⁷ In criticism of Professor Norwood's view, it may be said, in the first place, that obstinacy is not a prominent characteristic of Antigone, nor does the poet want us to think that it is; in the second place, his statement does not explain the problem and means nothing more than saying that if Antigone had not acted as she did, there would have been no drama.

Tycho von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf in his critical work on the dramatic technique of Sophocles (*Die dramatische Technik des Sophokles*) has given more serious thought than anyone else to the matter. He points out the dramatic importance of the second burial. The most significant part of his discussion runs as follows: "Now let the arrangement of the plot be so contrived that Antigone was seized immediately after the completion of the burial; if this is assumed, then we should have this situation: The announcement of the transgression of Creon's edict and the announcement of the arrest of Antigone would in that case come together in one report, and then the impression of the arrest of Antigone, who stood there alive before all eyes, would of necessity have to overshadow the other. The effect of her victory over Creon would be effaced, if we first learned of it at the time when she herself is seen in his presence a prisoner and condemned to death."⁸ If one turns now from this imaginary arrangement of the plot to *Antigone* as it has come down to us, the advantage of Sophocles' drama over the above hypothetical plot is apparent, for not only is the action of our

play enlivened and its suspense heightened, but the news of the successful burial, startling and incredible as it is, has the very greatest effect, an effect that is still further increased by the fact that no one knows how the burial could possibly have been accomplished. And so the poet should not be blamed for not giving a reason for Antigone's second visit to the corpse. So runs Tycho's view.

The solution of the problem is to be found, not merely in the necessity of a dramatic arrangement of the plot, as young Wilamowitz maintains, nor in Professor Norwood's interpretation of the play, but in the character of Antigone, as Sophocles wishes us to see it.

The temperament of Antigone is essentially tragic. Like all really great tragic characters, she centers her whole being on one object, and when she is opposed she becomes exalted and blind to every other consideration. What A. C. Bradley says about the marked one-sidedness of the tragic type in Shakespeare can be equally applied to Antigone: "It is a fatal gift, but it carries with it a touch of greatness; and when there is joined to it nobility of mind or genius or immense force, we realize the full power and reach of the soul, and the conflict in which it engages acquires that magnitude which stirs not only sympathy and pity, but admiration, terror, and awe."⁹ Antigone's complete absorption in one idea or interest is manifested in her passionate support of what she considers right and in her courageous love of her dear ones.¹⁰ Strength of conviction and intensity of feeling attain in her a great force. When she is brought into conflict with a selfish person, like Ismene, the utter unselfishness and self-sacrifice of her nature stand out clearly, and they are thrown into even sharper relief when she has to face Creon, who also is one-sided in that he cannot get beyond the idea of the supremacy of the state.

This is the Antigone the poet presents to us. When she finds the corpse uncovered, she is still under the influence of strong emotion. The thought that she has already done her duty does not in such circumstances cross her mind. The only thing she can see or think of at this moment is the shame and indignity

that have been heaped upon one of her brothers. Impelled by her great love of him and urged on by a strong sense of her duty to do her utmost for him since she is nearest of kin to him, she rushes forth with no thought of herself or her own safety but determined to add a little more to her first feeble efforts to speed the soul of Polynices to its last resting place in the House of Hades. Sophocles is at pains to show the surge of emotion that swept over her when she saw the body bare of the dust, and he describes the scene with these stirring words: "And when, after a long while, this storm had passed, the maid was seen; and she cried aloud with the sharp cry of a bird in its bitterness,—even as when, within the empty nest, it sees the bed stripped of its nestlings. So she also, when she saw the corpse bare, lifted up a voice of wailing, and called down curses on the doers of that deed."¹¹ When Antigone buries Polynices the first time, we think no less of her duty than we do of her love; when she buries him the second time, we think only of her love.

A word in conclusion: Tycho von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff makes it clear that it would have been wrong from a dramatic point of view to represent Antigone as captured at the time of the first burial. The present writer accepts this point fully, but going a step further maintains that the reason for the second burial lies in the intensity of Antigone's nature, in her intense love, loyalty, and tenderness for a member of her family, in her intense and uncompromising sense of her duty to bury her dead brother.

J. L. ROSE

Duke University

NOTES

¹ *Die dramatische Technik des Sophokles*, S. 31 (Berlin, 1917).

² *Soph. Ant.* 245.

³ *Soph. Ant.* 422 ff.

⁴ *Sophocles, The Antigone*, note on verse 429 (Cambridge, 1900).

⁵ Carelessness in regard to motivation is confined, for the most part, to the entrances and exits of the actors.

(Concluded on page 251)

A Poet's-Eye View of Philosophy

Beauty is truth, truth beauty,—that is all
Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know.

IT WAS a young poet who wrote these lines, a poet who did not have the patience and would not have the time to pursue truth for its own sake. John Keats looked along and thoughtfully at the ornaments and figures on a Grecian urn. They reminded him of a religion, of a civilization, of a way of life that had long since disappeared. They filled him with despair. There was so much wisdom and knowledge beyond his reach. He had regretfully to be content with beauty and tell himself it was enough.

We have no warrant, I realize, for squeezing more out of these lines than they were ever meant to yield. We should have no right, even if it were possible, to ask Keats what he meant by saying that beauty is truth. For all the poets can claim the privilege which Matthew Arnold awards to Shakespeare:

Others abide our question. Thou art free.
We ask and ask: Thou smilest and art still,
Out-topping knowledge.

And as if this were not enough, we have the example of the Sophists, who made a kind of game out of the business of proving or disproving their fanciful theses by quotations from the poets, a game which Plato satirizes vigorously in the *Protagoras*. Socrates, we learn in the *Apology*, went to the poets, among others, hoping to refute the oracle of Apollo that had acclaimed him as the wisest of men. He found that poets were so far from being wise that almost anybody could explain their meaning better than they could. The poet, says Plato, is inspired in the same manner as the prophet. Only the thinker can interpret him. He himself is but the instrument of the Muses.

But perhaps Keats himself can help us. In a letter to his friend Bailey, he wrote:

I am certain of nothing but of the holiness of the heart's affections, and the truth of Imagination. What the Imagination seizes as Beauty must be Truth, whether it existed before or not.

A few lines further on in the same letter, Keats says that he has "never yet been able to perceive how anything can be known for truth by consecutive reasoning." "Can it be that even the greatest philosopher ever arrived at his goal without putting aside numerous objections?" Evidently Keats wants his verse to be about truth, to be truth. He leaps boldly to the conclusion that the Imagination, by which he seems to mean poetic inspiration, arrives at the truth at one stride, without benefit of dialectics. The work of the poetic imagination, he says, is beauty, and beauty must be truth, whether it corresponds to something that existed before or not. Beauty may be truth, because we feel it to be truth.

Keats was a young man. He had no time to work out a philosophy. The *Quatrains* of Omar Khayyám were written by an old man who had been through all the philosophical curriculum, a man who was a skilled mathematician and had made certain improvements in the calendar. Yet he speaks with as little respect for the processes of reason as the young poet, Keats.

Myself when young did eagerly frequent
Doctor and Saint, and heard great argument
About it and about; but evermore
Came out by the same door where I went.

And what recommendation does the Persian make?

Waste not your Hour, nor in the vain pursuit
Of This and That endeavour and dispute;
Better be jocund with the fruitful Grape
Than sadden after none, or bitter, Fruit.

Is this very different advice from that of Keats? I think not. Wine and inspiration have much in common. Both poets seem to be telling us to trust our feelings, to trust life, and not to try to figure everything out before we get down to the business of enjoying life poetically, inspirationally, emotionally. We are not to spend our lives looking for a key that does not exist. Reason will bring us no nearer to the truth. Let us then abjure philos-

ophy and pledge our undivided loyalty to poetry!

I am not especially concerned with the worth of this view. It might be reduced philosophically to scepticism, to sensationalism, or to an over-emphasis on one aspect of experience. But for Keats, at any rate, it was a function of the imagination. Imagination is something the definition of which we can only approach cautiously. The poets and critics who used the word in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century were never quite in agreement about its meaning. Sometimes it seems to be a kind of sympathy which, by presenting to our minds and emotions the affairs, tragic and happy, of our fellow men, makes us larger persons and endows us with a kind of competence for speaking, nor merely for ourselves, but for man. In his youth John Stuart Mill felt a lack of this quality. He writes in his *Autobiography*:

My zeal was as yet little else at that period of my life, than zeal for speculative opinions. It had not its root in genuine benevolence or sympathy with mankind; though these qualities held their due place in my ethical standard. Nor was it connected with any high enthusiasm for ideal nobleness. Yet of this feeling I was imaginatively very susceptible; but there was at that time an intermission of its natural aliment, poetical culture, while there was a superabundance of the discipline antagonistic to it, that of mere logic and analysis. Add to this that my father's teachings tended to the undervaluing of feeling.

The poet to whom Stuart Mill resorted more than to any other for such poetical culture was Wordsworth. Wordsworth has a great deal to say about poetic imagination. "Imagination," he tells us in the Preface to the Edition of 1815, "has no reference to images that are merely a faithful copy, existing in the mind, of absent external objects; but is a word of higher import, denoting operations of the mind upon these objects, and processes of creation or of composition, governed by certain fixed laws."

To do Wordsworth's ideas anything like justice, we should have to scan carefully the long poem in which he is most concerned to show us how he became a poet. In this poem, *The Prelude*, he talks everywhere as if natural scenery, mountains, clouds, lakes, and moors

had the power, alone and unaided, to lead a man to a lofty poetic vision of all life and truth. The process is summarized in the following lines:

Wisdom and Spirit of the universe!
Thou Soul that art the eternity of thought
That givest to forms and images a breath
And everlasting motion, not in vain
By day or star-light thus from my first dawn
Of childhood didst thou intertwine for me
The passions that build up our human soul;
Not with the mean and vulgar works of man
But with high objects, with enduring things—
With life and nature—purifying thus
The elements of feeling and of thought,
And sanctifying, by such discipline,
Both pain and fear, until we recognize
A grandeur in the beatings of the heart.

There is no end to this sort of utterance in *The Prelude*. The poet himself admits: "My drift I fear is scarcely obvious." Yet it is not altogether obscure, either. Everyone enjoys the experiences of which Wordsworth is speaking. It is all a matter of degree and of awareness of what one is about. I do not suppose that many people enjoy this kind of exhilaration in as high a degree or as uninterruptedly as Wordsworth.

Wordsworth does not eschew philosophy. He thinks he has it. Yet I think we must agree that he was not a philosopher, that, in fact, the general drift of his thought is to renounce the dialectical method in favor of an extraordinarily vague kind of intuition, a communion with beauty. Turning from Keats and Wordsworth to their contemporary, Shelley, we are confronted with a man who was at once the most poetical of all poets and very nearly a philosopher. He wrote numerous pamphlets on proposed reforms, translated a dialogue of Plato; his poems abound with respectful remarks about philosophy. He thought, moreover, that he had a message for mankind and regarded his poetry as an instrument of propaganda. In the Preface to his epic poem, the *Revolt of Islam*, he writes:

I have sought to enlist the harmony of metrical language, the ethereal combinations of the fancy, the rapid and subtle transitions of human passion, all those elements which essentially compose a Poem, in the cause of a liberal and comprehensive morality; and in the view of kindling within the bosoms of my readers a virtuous

enthusiasm for those doctrines of liberty and justice, that faith and hope in something good, which neither violence nor misrepresentation nor prejudice can ever totally extinguish among mankind.

Shelley knew his way around in the literature of philosophy. He speaks of the "education peculiarly fitted for a Poet," and offers his own credentials:

I have considered Poetry in its most comprehensive sense; and have read the Poets and Historians and the Metaphysicians whose writings have been accessible to me, and have looked upon the beautiful and majestic scenery of the earth, as common sources of those elements which it is the province of the Poet to embody and combine.

In the Preface to the *Prometheus Unbound* Shelley disclaims didacticism and says:

My purpose has hitherto been simply to familiarize the highly refined imagination of the more select classes of poetical readers with beautiful idealisms of moral excellence; aware that until the mind can love, and admire, and trust, and hope, and endure, reasoned principles of moral conduct are seeds cast upon the highway of life which the unconscious passenger tramples into dust, although they would bear the harvest of his happiness.

The idea that poetry might, if the poet were great enough, stir men's minds with yearnings for justice and freedom and institute a new age, appears explicitly in Shelley's best known poem, *The Ode to the West Wind*:

Drive my dead thoughts over the universe
Like withered leaves to quicken a new birth!
And, by the incantation of this verse,
Scatter, as from an unextinguished hearth
Ashes and sparks, my words among mankind!
Be through my lips to unawakened earth
The trumpet of a prophecy! O, Wind,
If Winter comes, can Spring be far behind?

Yet, except for this sense of an obligation to help mankind on to a better day, it seems to me that his philosophy is only a little more explicit than that of Wordsworth and Keats. He remains a devotee in the same temple with them and, like them, worships

That Light whose smile kindles the Universe,
That Beauty in which all things work and move.

Perhaps the most learned of all English poets was John Milton, who said, "How charming is divine Philosophy," and whose *Paradise Lost* is steeped in the lore of the ancients and of the Christian fathers. But the

examples offered are enough for our purpose. We see that the poet, *qua* poet, does not make use of the philosophical method. Even such an exception as Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* comes near to proving the rule; for it is not so much the careful expositions of the atomic system that give Lucretius' poem its grandeur, as it is the passionate earnestness with which the poet seeks to dethrone superstition and liberate mankind from baseless fears.

The philosopher's-eye view of poetry has more numerous facets. To Plato's strictures on poetry, that the poet is a creator of imitations of imitations, and that by his appeal to the emotional and irrational part of the soul he encourages us to indulge in a kind of luxurious self-pity which entails a view of life directly counter to the equanimity which philosophy inculcates—to these strictures the best answer is that of Shelley, that Plato was himself essentially a poet. I respect Plato more than any other writer, even more than Shakespeare and Homer. If a young man asked me to what author he had best apply his mind with a view to gaining a general understanding, in breadth of thought, and personality, I should name Plato. Nevertheless, there is much in Plato to which I cannot subscribe. His remarks on poetry come under this heading.

To bring them down to date, let us consider the modern novel. There have been bad novels, hysterical novels, corrupt novels, and I have no doubt that some of them have done much harm. They have made people who had relatively little to complain about discover something to wail over. Many of them tend to foster the idea that the individual has the right to expect certain amenities of life; that, for example, a person who has never seen fit to exercise his mind is entitled to register a complaint when he discovers that he has no mind to exercise. This inverted kind of paternalism even survives the belief in a Father Dispenser, and there are people who pride themselves on their atheistic convictions and yet go on talking as if their Father in heaven had played a dirty trick on them.

There is no doubt, I think, that our novels, and, in even greater degree, our moving pic-

tures, have affected our manners, our way of thinking, and our ability to meet the situations that arise and must be met. Perhaps the most harmful effect has been to make people assume roles at the various crises of their lives instead of acting naturally. But perhaps people have to be false before they can be sure that they know how to be sincere. Sincerity is the last act. Really to be sincere, one has to know oneself; and how can one know oneself unless one has explored the possibilities? You stand in front of the mirror of life and make faces at yourself. If you are lucky, you find the face that fits you; you find yourself.

Aristotle met Plato's criticism of poetry with his famous and enigmatic sentence to the effect that through the working of pity and fear tragic poetry effects a catharsis of such emotions. I do not pretend to understand this much tortured sentence any better than the scholars who have worked out some hundred and fifty-two different interpretations of it, but I feel certain that it ought to mean that vicarious experience does not stimulate the emotions so much as it relieves them by affording them a relatively harmless outlet. I do not believe that this is an adequate reply to Plato's objections. I think that poetry and fiction have indeed modified our ways of living, have almost made us over into different creatures; and I do not suppose that the change has always been an improvement. But I do not understand how Plato or any other human being can so far play providence with the vulgar as to decide for us when, in what respects, and how far we can afford to change.

For some years I have been trying to make sense out of Greek civilization. Whence, I have asked myself, whence this amazing and beautiful religion, whence these grand conceptions of the divinity of man, whence this irresistible artistic urge? I know that many explanations have been offered, and I do not suppose that any single one can account for so overwhelming a phenomenon. But if any one of the factors that went to the making of Greek civilization deserves special mention, I think it must be the epic poems of Homer. I do not believe it is possible to overestimate the influence of these poems upon the mind

of Greece. The humanization of the gods, the incentive for sculptors and artists to represent for public view such noble figures, the obligation to build temples worthy of them, the stimulus to lyric and choral poetry in prayer to them, and the supreme offering of the tragedies of Aeschylus and Sophocles and the comedies of Aristophanes—it is almost impossible to mention anything great in Greek culture that did not derive in part from Homer. So that we might say to Plato: "You cannot banish Homer from your Republic, for without Homer, there is no Republic, there is no Plato."

I am aware that in giving Homer credit for the wonder that was Greece, I have not really solved anything; for I have not explained Homer, and, after all, Homer was a Greek. I do not suppose that he was an innovator, I do not suppose that the stories he tells are original, and I am far from suggesting that he was an original thinker. It may well be doubted whether any great poet has ever been an original thinker. Life is a short time. The mind becomes oriented and misses the detail of other horizons. A poet who gives his major attention to problems of language and narration and organization is likely to borrow his ideas from others. I think it would not be difficult to demonstrate that English poets and novelists have generally been about fifty years behind European philosophy. Is not Wordsworth's quasi-religion of nature and beauty an echo of Rousseau? And is not the stark pessimism of Hardy's novels and verse almost the same kind of pessimism as that of Schopenhauer? If, then, the poet passes over the methods of philosophy in favor of a more direct apprehension of truth, the philosopher may in turn point out the poet's philosophical sources.

In any case, it would not be easy to hit upon an original idea that would be available for poetic purposes. The field has been pretty well worked over. There have been a number of curious approaches to this subject by recent critics. One critic takes Housman to task for the paucity of his ideas. Another has published a lengthy study of Robert Frost, whose ideas he finds somewhat less than mature. I

regard both criticisms as invalid. I think there is no lack of ideas in Housman, though I concede, and it is to his credit as a poet, that his strength is not in his ideas but in his art. I think Frost has plenty of good ideas, but I do not often like the way he uses them—or, I might say, the way he hides them. Frost comes dangerously near having too many ideas. That is to say, the thought, even though it is smothered with indirectness, stands out so prominently that it almost overwhelms the poetry. Perhaps that is because the poetry is not so magical as it might be.

The poet ought, I think, to have philosophic conceptions. Poems ought to mean something. Some of our modern poets seem to have set up absolute meaninglessness as their objective, and there are others who err in the other direction and string out disjointed, not to say elementary, lectures on time and space and history and anything else that might get into a term paper for a course in introductory philosophy, under the impression that they are being profound.

Let me again endorse Plato, this time as the best possible reading for the aspirant to the poetic art. Plato will acquaint him with the main problems of philosophy, and Plato will inspire him with the poetic beauty of his style. The poet stands to gain, I think, from a fairly thorough philosophic training. He is going to borrow ideas: let him shop around and know where to look for them. He is going to be possessed by ideas. Let him acquire so much acquaintance with them that he will not, like a country boy come to town, be imposed upon by the specious and the meretricious. Let him get so used to them that he is no longer nervous in their presence and does not yearn after them.

Let me offer one more reason for studying philosophy, a reason which is valid enough for anybody but especially cogent for the poet. It is that every idea is related to all other ideas. Every idea sheds light on all other ideas. Our understanding of the simple ideas we picked up in childhood will be immeasurably deepened and enriched by the experience of living and learning and thinking. If we have started from the truth, we shall

surely find our way back to the truth. If we go all the way with philosophy, we shall come back where we started from. For philosophy is another world like that of which Housman says:

The world is round, so travellers tell,
And straight though reach the track,
Trudge on, trudge on, 'twill all be well,
The way will guide one back.

The poet need fear not. Philosophy is its own best antidote. The poet will find his way back to poetry and back to beauty, and if he is no longer disposed to identify beauty and truth, he will understand that they are two views of the same thing. To the philosopher truth is the reality and beauty an embellishment; to the poet truth is a great vein of marble, and beauty is the reality, the word without which truth might sleep on in its ancient hills, powerless to quicken the imagination of man with Olympian majesty.

Thus the poet and the philosopher tend to patronize each other. Now and then they chafe under their need of one another. Then the philosopher seems to take a pride in his unreadability, and the poet fights shy of meaning as if it were the one thing most likely to disqualify a poem. Between such poets and the critics who talk as if meaning were the sole essential of poetry, the innocent reader may well throw up his hands and decide to have nothing to do with any but the dead poet on whom he may be required to write a term paper or a doctoral dissertation.

I deprecate such a counsel of despair. If a dancer advertised that he would execute a complex ballet without using his legs, I might wish to watch the performance, if only to learn how essential legs are to a ballet dancer. If a composer presents a symphony entirely free from the distracting effect of melody, I am interested in the experiment as a means of revealing to myself how much I depend on melody for enjoyment in music. So too I read the poems that challenge me to find meaning in them. I enjoy the contest, and it heartens me to learn that there are so many artists willing to sacrifice their own creative powers in the interest of a succeeding generation of poets. What they will think, I do not know.

As for me, I prefer poetry that makes use of meaning, of philosophic truth, as if it were but one of the primary colors on the palette of the artist, and I want the thought of a poem to be as unmistakable and as unobtrusive as the metre, the diction, the imagery, and the movement and form of the poem as a whole. I believe that the greatest poetry is likely to be that which fulfills these requirements.

EDWARD B. STEVENS

Muhlenberg College

We See By the Papers

Edited by John F. Latimer

ULTIMUS ANNUS CONFUSIONIS

THIS IS A REFERENCE, NOT to the current scene—as appropriate and hopeful as the phrase might be—but to the year 46 B.C. According to *Topics of the Times* (March 16, 1952), whose knowledge of things classical is rarely to be questioned, it was exactly 445 days long. That was and is something of a world record both B.C. and A.D., and made that year about as long as most years seem now. Unless, of course, one reckons years by the lapse of time between consecutive Ides of March.

But we should not blame Divus Julius for that. It was not his intent to transform the original rustic Roman holiday, which Ovid describes in the *Fasti* in terms “as fresh as if it had been written yesterday,” into a deadline race with the Collector of Internal Revenue. The soothsayer’s unheeded warning to him, however, and the current collocation epitomized some years ago by Dorothy Parker’s *Death and Taxes*, may have double significance in some quarters. The evils of Caesarism are still rampant under the modern designation of Stalinism. Perhaps it matters little that it was Augustus rather than Julius who “introduced the trick of keeping alive democratic forms under an absolute dictatorship, which has proved so useful to modern dictators.” Perhaps it is mere coincidence that Nicholas II was forced to abdicate on March 15, 1917. It is not mere coincidence that his eventual successor is more of a Czar by far. We American taxpayers have long

since learned to beware of the Ides of March. Is it too much to hope that taxpayers everywhere will force dictators to beware and that this may be the *ultimus annus confusionis*?

AMERICAN AND ROMAN HISTORY

FUTURE HISTORIANS of the present period may well remark on the frequency with which writers of our day draw monitory examples or parallels from ancient sources. A *Washington Post* editorial of March 16, 1952 is another case in point. The editorial comments on the difficulty of explaining the reasons for the prevalence of juvenile crime, and cites two case studies on the subject which have appeared in the past few years. The author of these studies points to a change in the character of juvenile delinquency since the War. The new type of delinquent is “more intelligent, more calculating and usually comes from economically favored classes.” This seems to indicate that “youth is simply responding to the moral and aesthetic climate in which it has been reared. And after all,” as the writer of the two studies pointed out, “it is the grown-ups who have made the climate.”

“The Romans,” who were well acquainted with this kind of moral climate, “had a name for it. They called it *luxuria*. It became prevalent with the civil disturbances and the increasing prosperity of the later years of the Republic, and unless we have been grossly deceived by the historians, it got worse rather than better with each succeeding generation.” If we have been prone to associate *luxuria* with the fall of the Empire rather than of the Republic, this is indeed a timely reminder.

Another such reminder comes from George E. Sokolosky, whose article was clipped by Miss Essie Hill from the *Arkansas Democrat* (Feb. 24, 1952) of Little Rock. Under the caption, “Roman Errors Impressed Washington,” the well-known columnist states that although Washington “could have been king,” his knowledge of Roman history taught him the dangers of ambition and that “power tends to expand until it explodes, until it destroys itself.” He knew that “Caesar had involved Rome in the affairs of all nations so that Rome became not the capital of the Roman state but of a world empire,” and that “the burdens of empire became so great that to meet them, the Romans lost many of the freedoms they had gained over nearly five centuries.” Washington knew that in a Republic under a written Constitution the preservation of that Constitu-

tion would be the best guarantee for the maintenance of freedom. In his "Farewell Address" he recommended that there be no change in the Constitution "by usurpation; for though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

CHURCHILL'S CLASSICAL GENEALOGY

THE GREATEST ENGLISHMAN of the 20th century may disclaim all knowledge of the Classics, but his rotund and rolling prose and felicitous phraseology may owe something via his bloodstream to that perennial source. At any rate George Kennedy, writing in Washington's *Evening Star* (Jan. 17, 1952), quotes from one of Lord Randolph Churchill's pre-marriage love letters to Jenny Jerome in Paris:

When I feel very cross and angry I read Gibbon's whose profound philosophy and easy though majestic writing soon quiets me down. When I feel low and desponding, I read Horace, whose thorough epicureanism, quiet maxims and beautiful verse are most tranquillising.

Mr. Kennedy took the quotation from the two-volume biography of the elder Churchill by his son, on the occasion of the latter's induction into the Society of the Cincinnati the day before.

DI SALLE AND DIOCLETIAN

SOME SUCH COMPARISON as this was inevitable. Although our first Price Stabilizer has now been succeeded by Gov. Arnall, the governor may read it and weep. Classicists also.

It is the little fellows who are difficult to force into compliance. In the forty years after Diocletian published his list of prices (301 A.D.) it would seem, from the monthly price lists set up by the workmen's and the sellers' guilds in Egypt, that the Roman Government had given up its efforts to dictate the prices to the little fellows.

Actually it compromised. The guilds had long before that been registered and brought under Government controls.

These remarks were made by William L. Westermann, Professor Emeritus of History at Columbia University, at a symposium at the Metropolitan Museum of Art on "The Age of Diocletian," and reported in the *New York Times* (Dec. 16, 1951). Another speaker at the symposium was Gilbert Highet, professor of Greek and Latin at Columbia, who spoke on "Books and the Crisis."

The modern attempt to control prices has at least two disadvantages over its Roman counterpart: Professor Westermann estimated that the emperor's price list comprised about 2,000 items, "while today's average drugstore carries nearly 50,000 items, each of which must have its price determined separately. The present threat of inflation is more difficult to handle too, since the "printing press . . . can turn out the money much more swiftly than the stamps in the hands of the ancient coin minters."

CAESAR CUM PATTON IN GALLIA

ALTHOUGH HIS *Commentaries* are in some academic disrepute these days, his faithful followers will be glad to have another tribute to his practical value from a soldier who has often been compared to him.

You know that old baldheaded Roman blankety blank was one of the greatest blankety blank students of terrain this blankety blank world has ever seen. Well, all the so-and-so rivers and you-know-what hills in France are in just the same same spot as they were in Caesar's day. So all I had to do when I was chasing those (censored) Krauts across France and we came to a river or a ridge of hills was to say, "Where did that old Roman so-and-so cross or get through?" and then I'd say, "If it was good enough for Julius it's good enough for George," and over we'd go . . .

It is not necessary to add that these remarks were made by the late General George S. Patton, USA, as reported by J. P. McEvoy in *Cincinnati Times-Star* (June 2, 1951). They were relayed to this department by Professor J. Penrose Harland of the University of North Carolina.

THE ESQUILINE AND THE COELIAN

"WHERE IN NEW YORK is a cemetery under a city park?"

The answer to this query in the *New York Herald-Tribune* (Jan. 29, 1952)—St. John's Burying Ground, taken over by the city in 1896 for a public park and recently renamed the James J. Walker Park—reminded Dr. E. Adelaide Hahn, of Hunter College, of an ancient precedent. It made her think "at once of the transformation of the Esquiline, once a burial-ground, into a site for the palace and gardens of Maecenas. As is well known, Horace's *Priapus* satire (1.8) marks the transition period . . . The moving in of Priapus himself, the garden-god, betokens the change. As he says himself:

Nunc licet Esquilis habitare salubribus atque
agere in aprico spatii, quo modo tristis
albis informem spectabat ossibus agrum; (14-16)

A day earlier the *Tribune* announced another transformation of the opposite kind, so to speak. Archaeologists, under the general direction of Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York, had completed the restoration in Rome of one of the city's "handsomest medieval zones . . . on the Coelian, one of Rome's seven original hills." The spot is an oblong square flanked by the "ancient church of Saints John and Paul . . . the church's Twelfth Century belltower and a monastery, nearly 1000 years old."

"At one point, the workers dug down 20 feet to expose the huge arches of the Temple of Claudius, which dates from the First Century of the Christian Era. The arches were built to be a passageway to the nearby Colosseum, but had to be appropriated to serve as foundations for the five-storey monastery and the seven-storey bell-tower."

HEADLINES AND TITLES

"Corruption Came, Saw and Conquered."
(Washington's *Evening Star*, 12/3/51)

"Seeking Atlantis Again." (*Evening Star*, 11/19/51)

"New Work at Pompeii. (*Ibid.* 1/3/52)

"Prof. Haight Praises Chase Translation, Gibney Production of Ancient Greek Mimes About Two Adolescents and Love." (*The Vassar Chronicle*, 2/16/52)

"Three Tempted Him. The Judgment of Paris. By Gore Vidal." (*NYT Book Review*, 3/9/52)

"War of the Gladiators. Spartacus. By Howard Fast." (*Ibid.* 2/3/52)

"President Tosses G.O.P. An 'Apple of Discord.'" (*NYT*, 11/25/51)

GREAT IDEAS OF WESTERN MAN

(Supplied by Dr. Frank M. Snowden, Jr.,
Howard University)

THIS SERIES, published by the "Container Corporation of America" in some of the leading current magazines, constitutes a public service which does honor to the business men of America. Familiar as some of these are to readers of

this JOURNAL, their great truths need re-emphasis today more than ever.

ARISTOTLE on the importance of the constitution in a democracy:

In democracies of the more extreme type there has arisen a false idea of freedom which is contrary to the true interests of the state. For two principles are characteristic of a democracy, the government of the majority and freedom. Men think that what is just is equal; and that equality is the supremacy of the popular will; and that freedom means the doing what a man likes. In such democracies everyone lives as he pleases But this is all wrong; men should not think it slavery to live according to the rule of the constitution; for it is their salvation.

HERODOTUS on freedom of discussion:

It is impossible, if no more than one opinion is uttered, to make a choice of the best: a man is forced then to follow whatever advice may have been given him; but if opposite speeches are delivered, then choice can be exercised. In like manner pure gold is not recognized by itself; but when we test it along with baser ore, we perceive which is better.

SOCRATES on doing right or wrong:

A man who is good for anything ought not to calculate the chance of living or dying; he ought to only to consider whether in doing anything he is doing right or wrong For neither in war nor yet at law ought I or any man to use every means of escaping death The difficulty, my friends, is not to avoid death, but to avoid unrighteousness Wherefore, O judges, be of good cheer about death, and know of a certainty that no evil can happen to a good man in life or after death.

MARCUS AURELIUS ANTONINUS on one world:

The reason, in respect of which we are rational beings, is common; if this is so, common also is the reason which commands us what to do, and what not to do; if this is so, there is a common law also; if this is so, we are fellow-citizens; if this is so, we are members of some political community; if this is so, the world is in a matter of state My nature is rational and social; and my city and country, so far as I am Antoninus, is Rome; but so far as I am a man, it is the world.

NOTES

Contributions to this department in the form of brief objective notes should be sent direct to the editor, Oscar E. Nybakken, State University of Iowa, 124 Schaeffer Hall, Iowa City, Iowa.

NOTES ON HORACE AS A "METAPHYSICAL" POET

THE DELICACY AND SUBTLETY of Horatian irony has rendered some of his odes virtually untranslatable. One illuminating instance of Horace's extraordinary technique, and one that recommends itself to the reader who is drawn to the ironies and the paradoxes of the "New Criticism" in English poetry, occurs in Odes II, 4, "Ad Xanthiam Phoeum."

The elusiveness of this ode is pointed up by representative translations appearing in two excellent modern editions of Horace's poems. In his *Selected Poems of Horace* (Van Nostrand, New York, 1947), George F. Whicher offers Richard Duke's "Precedents for Xanthias," while Casper J. Kraemer, Jr. (*The Complete Works of Horace*, Modern Library, New York, 1936) has chosen Theodore Martin's racier "Love is Like That." Both poems seem to me to miss the point as well as the flavor of the original. The former is so lyrical and chaste in imagery as almost to persuade us that Horace is expressing approval and even a wistful admiration for the enamoured youth. At the other extreme, Theodore Martin's robust, almost lewd, rendering is broadly sarcastic at the expense of Xanthias's below-stairs romance. A close reading of the original poem may reveal both what is lost and what is preserved in these variant translations.

The Latin poem, patterned into six stanzas, divides naturally into three parts with complex interconnections. In the first three stanzas Horace ostensibly reassures Xanthias by putting him in the company of earlier heroes who have found the charms of slave-girls irresistible; in the fourth and fifth stanzas he asserts, with suspiciously hollow conviction, that Phyllis must surely be high-

born, though the evidence is only circumstantial; in the concluding lines he seeks to allay Xanthias's jealous fears by asserting his own unprejudiced and passionless admiration for the beautiful slave-girl. However, one immediate effect of this *diminuendo* in the pattern is to alert the reader to the innuendos of the figures. When we examine the poem a little closer the actual argument of the poem takes shape suddenly, like the secondary figure in an optical illusion.

In the first place, Horace has probably purposely chosen a Greek name for his youthful addressee. Even in Horace's day, though still more in Juvenal's, the Greek had come to symbolize luxury, indolence, and foppery. And from Greek Xanthias it is a logical imaginative flight to his noble forbears before Troy; but what precedents do they actually offer? Was not Achilles' beauteous Briseis the occasion of the ruinous quarrel between that sulky hero and King Agamemnon, and did not Achilles meet his death before he had much leisure to enjoy his restored concubine? Ajax, we remember, is a sheep-slaughtering madman in the Sophoclean tragedy which recounts his capture and espousal of the Princess Tecmessa. Finally, the reference to Agamemnon is replete with double meanings: *Arsit Atrides medio in triumpho Virgine raptā*. The captive maiden is of course Cassandra, but what fortune did she bring her new lord? The *raptā* may obliquely recall her ravishment by Ajax Oileus before Agamemnon lost his heart to her, and if so, may contain a veiled hint to Xanthias concerning the danger of anticipation in liaisons with slave-girls. In any event, we can hardly forget the reception prepared by Clytemnestra for

Agamemnon returning with a later love. In short, the precedents for Xanthias seem on reflection to be peculiarly unfortunate.

In the next section, Horace is delicately pointing out that the fair Phyllis is no more a captive Princess like Briseis, Tecmessa, and Cassandra than Xanthias himself is a warrior Prince like Achilles, Ajax, and Agamemnon. The *certe* and the *crede non* have exactly the opposite force in this context. Nothing is less certain than that Phyllis is sprung from a line of kings for whom she may justly weep, or more likely than that her grasping parent (*lucro aversam* can be taken as recalling potently the notorious dishonesty of Roman slaves) would prove a most embarrassing mother-in-law.

With this foundation, the last stanza drives the point home. Horace is not at an age to be taken seriously when he asserts that he is beyond being moved by feminine charms, and this simple fact reflects back through the

other ironies of the poem. Perhaps more pointed still are the terms of his praise of Phyllis. They are all purely physical charms; nothing is said of her intelligence or accomplishments. Looking back, we discover that it was Briseis's bosom of snow, and not her diverting conversation which captivated Achilles. If it were true that Horace, nearing forty, is immune to Phyllis's charms, what has Xanthias to look forward to when his passion has cooled and her beauty has faded, if he succumbs intemperately to it now?

It is more than likely that Xanthias, Phyllis, and Horace *integer* are all three imaginative inventions of the poet. Nevertheless this ode emerges as a piece of excellent friendly advice to any young patrician, compounded of playfulness and sober good sense, and a brilliant example of Horace's celebrated urbanity.

BRUCE DEARING

Swarthmore College

TWO SUGGESTIONS

It so happens that both of these suggestions run counter to the Editor's *prejudices*. But this has little bearing on their potential value. Certainly specific guidance as to techniques of reading in the Latin order should be given for students reading Ciceronian Latin, if the first suggestion about altered word-order is not followed. And the second suggestion has the additional merit of illustrating by the Latin style used in making it the practice it favors. We are in any case in a situation where extreme conservatism is dangerous; and any opinion presented, however bold, has the merit of being thought-provoking and should be fairly considered.

STREAMLINED LATIN

THE PURPOSE of this article is to set forth certain, in the judgment of the writer, valid and sufficient reasons why it is a pedagogical mistake to use the Latin word order in secondary education. I realize that the views here set forth are contrary to those of many teachers of Latin, but I feel that there are other teachers of Latin, especially those who teach beginning classes and who bear the heat and burden of the day, to whom these suggestions will be welcome. Personally,

I am concerned chiefly that something shall be done which will make sure that Latin continues to be the most effective instrument of education that it can possibly be.

It is my experience as a teacher that the difficult thing in Latin is not vocabulary nor syntax nor forms, but word order. It is my opinion that if the difficulty of word order could be solved satisfactorily, much of the objection that is now raised against Latin would disappear. I feel sure this would be true as far as the student is concerned. To be sure school superintendents and educational psychologists might "rage and imagine vain things," but the student would rejoice and be glad. Much has been done to humanize forms, syntax, and vocabulary, but when it comes to word order the student is told, swallow it whole, even if it chokes you.

Not only is the order in which Latin words occur in a sentence difficult, but it partly defeats one purpose of Latin study, namely, its contribution to the student's use of English. Admittedly, English word order and literary Latin word order are basically and fundamentally different. Most students

think it very strange that when they have given a meaning to every word in the sentence it still does not make sense. It is the order of the words that baffles them. The most discouraging experience of a teacher is not that the student cannot give all the rules that concern *ut* or *cum*, but it is his disappointment over the student's translation. And if the student cannot translate well, then one of the goals of Latin study is not realized.

A most serious objection to Latin word order is that it is not likely the Romans themselves spoke in that order. There is always quite a gulf between colloquial and literary speech (language). Few of us speak or write in the manner and style of Hawthorne or Burke, to say nothing of Gibbon or Macaulay. But we are asking our students to do what the Romans themselves undoubtedly did not do,—speak and write as Cicero and Livy did. Unfortunately, but naturally, colloquial Latin has for the most part not been preserved, but the plays of Plautus indicate something of what it was like. At least they reveal a certain naturalness which is quite lacking in Livy and Tacitus. It would be valuable to know how many years it took a Roman boy to acquire a mastery of Cicero's style. We expect our students to do in two or three years what it must have taken a Roman boy several years to do. And he had the advantage of hearing the Latin language spoken. It is to be regretted that we do not have a series of graded Latin readers for our pupils just as we have in English.

Latin exists and has a place—a very important place—in our curriculum, not for its own sake, but for the sake of the pupil. Beautiful as is Latin literature, "Tully's voice, Vergil's lay, and Livy's pictured page," yet we would not regard it as an object of worship or too sacred to be touched. Latin was made for the pupil, not the pupil for Latin.

Our proposal is, therefore, that in the first two years of Latin work, the Latin sentences be arranged more in the English order of words, especially in those instances where the Latin order is utterly at variance with the English. Even in a very simple Latin sentence

the order of words may confuse the beginning student. I can still vividly recall an experience in my first year of Latin. We were reading the first chapter of the first Book of Caesar, and, coming upon the words *proximique sunt Germanis* practically every member of the class, which numbered fifty or more, had translated it "and next are the Germans," whereas, if the *sunt* had stood before *proximi*, most of the class would have read it correctly. In English the verb usually precedes the object; in Latin the reverse is true. In English the verb precedes the adverb; in Latin the adverb precedes the verb. In English the adjective quite regularly precedes its noun; in Latin quite often the adjective follows its noun. Therefore we question the pedagogical value of the pupil's too often reversing his natural way of thinking. Also it makes an additional hindrance in his learning the language when he has all he can do in mastering vocabulary, forms, and syntax. In spite of statements made by writers in classical periodicals to the contrary, it is doubtful if our pupils think *Equus meus niger est*. At any rate they do not do so naturally. Latin should help our English, not hinder it. Some editors of first year texts outdo Cicero himself in the matter of word order and persistently place the adjective and demonstrative after the noun where as a matter of fact the Latin writers place them as often before as after the noun. It is just a matter of which is the more emphatic.

Moreover, it should not be overlooked that the verb is the key to the sentence. The big question in the student's mind is not who or when or where or how, but *what*. It is the verb that tells him this. Therefore not to know what the verb is until the end of the sentence is quite mystifying and provoking.

It may be urged as an objection that the student will have the same difficulty to face when he begins the study of a Latin author whose writing has not thus been modified. That will be true to some extent but not nearly so much as would have been the case at the beginning. For now he will have the advantage of considerable mastery of the essentials of the language. Furthermore, stu-

dents who are interested enough to take more than two years of Latin should be willing to put forth greater effort.

What has been said thus far applies only to prose; for poetry is usually read after prose. Admittedly poetry cannot be changed. It is bound by the "shackles of the meter" as Professor Harold W. Johnston once expressed it. Nor need it be modified. The pupil understands that poetry is poetry. Also Latin poetry, in my modest opinion, is easier to read than Latin prose. The sentences are not so long and the thought groups are simpler. Certainly this is true of much of Ovid and Vergil.

Since so many high school students take only two years of Latin, it seems unreasonable to require them to master literary prose style when they will make so little use of it. If all students who begin the study of Latin were likely to continue it for four or five years, then there might be some reason for requiring a mastery of prose style.

There is no particular glory in making a subject as difficult as possible. This is not a part of our educational practice. For example, high school algebra could easily be made so difficult that no student, or very few, could handle it. The same is true of chemistry or history. But our practice is to adapt the subject to the ability and stage of development of the pupil.

A Latin literary sentence is like a painting. For, in a painting the features are put together as they are for the sake of certain effects,—for likeness, contrast, or emphasis. The artist has in mind the effect as a whole that he wishes to bring out and therefore makes all the features such as landscape, foreground, background, light and shade fit in in the most appropriate way and in the way they will best bring about the desired effect. Likewise in a Latin sentence it is the artistic whole which the writer has in mind. Accordingly he places his words where they will be emphatic or unemphatic, in contrast or in likeness. Sometimes one has to study a painting a long while before he sees in it all the artist intended to be seen. And this is very often true of the average pupil as he looks at his

Latin sentence,—he sees the parts instead of the whole. And unless he possesses an artistic sense as well as a knowledge of language he will not see all there is to be seen in the sentence. To use a common saying, he does not see the forest for the trees.

Some one may say that all the beauty and glory of Latin will be lost by modifying the word order. Perhaps so for the present generation which has been nurtured in it. But, possibly, even for this generation, it would sound just as stately and superb had the Romans used an order of words, say, more like the Greek. It does not suffer because the verb is not always found at the end of the sentence. Nor does Latin poetry suffer because the verb must fall into line with the requirements of the rhythm. Latin being an inflected language can have any order of words the writer wishes according to his purpose. Even Cicero deviated into the English order at the beginning of the First Catiline oration. It could well be the Romans would have liked a different order of words had they just thought about it.

Let us put it this way: suppose that the Germans had not entered the Empire and that Latin language had continued to be spoken and written down to the present time, changing and developing as all languages inevitably do. Certainly it would have changed greatly and it is possible the change would have been along the line indicated in this article and that the Romans would be using the word order of modern languages.

Modifying the Latin word order would be another way of adapting the Latin language to our needs. This process has been going on for many centuries. The Franks in Gaul adapted it to their needs and we have the French language. The peoples of Spain did the same and we have the Spanish language. Likewise we have ecclesiastical Latin, drug-gists' Latin, lawyers' Latin, and Latin in scientific terminology. We have taken over some Latin words bodily such as *corpus*, *opus*, *alumnus*, *consul*, *arbor*, *dictator*, etc.; others we have changed slightly as *capital*, *plumb*, *nerve*, *laboratory*, *library*; still others show more marked change as *curb*, *entire*, *funnel*,

dismal. Accordingly, modifying the Latin word order would be justified on the basis of precedent.

There is another rather pertinent reason for this change: if Latin is ever to be the international language, changes like this will have to be made before it will become acceptable to the present day world as the universal medium of communication. It appears now impossible for any modern language to serve this purpose. With some extension in the use of the prepositions *cum* and *in* and with some lessening in the number of case forms Latin could well be the international language.

Are we as teachers of Latin sincerely concerned about the saving of Latin? Scores of articles and notes have appeared in the *CLASSICAL JOURNAL*, setting forth personal and sometimes peculiar ideas and plans as to how Latin is to be saved. This suggestion of mine may seem to others just as peculiar and impossible. But if it would serve our purpose and encourage more students to enroll in our classes, why not give it a fair consideration? Here are four reasons in its favor: first, one less difficulty to be faced by the student at the beginning of his study of the language; second, no harm would be done his native tongue; third, it would be fairer to the student for whom any language is difficult; fourth, it would be fairer to Latin itself which suffers in competition with modern languages because the pupil has the impression that Latin is more difficult than a modern language.

In the opinion of the writer we should do one of two things: either admit that Latin is intended only for the few who have high intelligence and we should therefore cease our laments over the present status of Latin, or if we are in earnest in our insistence that Latin be a part of our democratic educational program, then we should adapt it to the needs and ability of the average student.

We are indebted to the Romans for three priceless possessions,—the Latin Alphabet, the Latin language, and Latin literature. Of these three undoubtedly the Latin Alphabet is the most valuable. It could even be said

that it is one of the most valuable single possessions mankind has. Of the other two it will be readily admitted that the Latin language, which makes up half the English language and whose vocabulary has been incorporated into our language almost entirely, is more valuable than its literature. Hence the importance of the study of the Latin language itself.

In this country for many years we have used the Roman method of pronouncing Latin. Formerly the English method was used. There is no doubt the Roman method is more correct and appealing. But certainly it is not so practical and its use has created serious difficulties. It has made Latin completely a foreign language. It was overlooked when this change was made that the value of Latin does not depend upon the method of pronunciation. A half century ago Professor Charles E. Bennett pointed out the disadvantages of the Roman pronunciation. A quotation from Professor Bennett may be pertinent to our discussion (Bennett and Bristol, *Teaching of Latin and Greek*, page 80): "The prime question in the teaching of every subject in our schools should be the present educational needs of the pupils." The needs of our students should take precedence over our admiration for the Latin language and for Latin literature.

It may be that our pupils are saying to us, though *taciti*, *Quo usque, tandem, abutemini, magistri Latinae linguae, patientia nostra?*

J. C. MORGAN

York College, Nebraska

De Usu Linguae Latinae

MEMORES ESSE HISTORIAE nobis necesse est. Traditiones nobiles nostrae civilisationis et consequenter libertatis nostrae et spirituales et politicae firmo nexae sunt memoriae collectivae praeteritis nostri. Omnis tyrannis ahistorica est, quod factum plane, quamquam modo ficto, in libro Georgii Orwell tituli "1984" descriptum est. quo loco horribilis tyrannis istorum annorum futurorum continue delet, falsificat, "emendat" historiam. Qua de causa omnes actus

omnes labores, omnia studia quae regenerationem et confirmationem conscientiae historicae nostrae adjuvant laudabilia bonaque sunt. Inter ea maximi momenti hoc studium est quod colit et conservat illam linguam, quae mater tantarum linguarum et instrumentum gloriosum continuitatis culturalis per saecula tenebrosa erat, linguam latinam. Vero, nova aetas obscura, novum mediaevum imminet, non solum in illis tyrannidibus orientalibus quibuscum aperte pugnamus, sed etiam hic in ista terra promissa, ubi ne videmus quidem semper pericula quae impendunt, e.g. indifferentiam adversum bona spiritalia, suspicionem intellectus, neglectum omnium studiorum quae non sunt utilitatis immediatae, iterata temptamina restrictionum docendi, discendi, loquendi, audiendi.

Etiamsi colendi et servandi linguam latinam rationes causaeque tantae sunt generis politici, tamen maximi ponderis certe sunt haec educationis et litterarum. Ingens est thesaurus litterarum linguae latinae, cujus thesauri plerumque novimus minimam partem, penitus negligentes immensas copias litterarum mediaevalium. Qui thesaurus summas inspirationes civilisationis occidentalis continet, et antiquae paganaeque et modernae christianaeque, nulla mentione facta gratiae artisticæ, virtutis historicae, stimulationis intellectualis. Postremo, quod spectat ad disciplinam intellectus et ademptionem verae urbanitatis, fere nihil discendo linguam latinam comparari potest. Lingua latina verum est idioma internationale, verbis breve, expressione lucidum, capax magnae subtilitatis. (Utinam disciplina isti linguae inhaerens exerceat potestatem suam beneficam contra verbotatem et inanitatem nostrarum litterarum!)

Qua de causa evanuit lingua latina qua idioma internationale et scientificum? Quia renaissance et reintroductio latinitatis classicae saeculorum post-mediaevalium fixit linguam latinam secundum linguam Ciceronianam, id est linguam artificialem et litteratam et immutabiliter perfectam. Sed quodcumque vivit constanter, continue, semper mutatur. Vita ullius viventis, seu linguae seu animalis

seu herbae, processus mutationis continua est. Quod non mutatur, mortuum est. Fingere linguam latinam secundum linguam priscam artificialem quae ne ab ipsis contemporaneis Ciceronis quidem in usû fuerat prohibuit et obstruxit evolutionem modernam huius linguae. Atque melius est male loqui latine quam non loqui latine omnino. Latinitas barbara qua utimur praeferri debet latinitati "correctae" at neglectae ignotaeque. Imperfectio vitae superior est perfectione mortis. Non audemus loqui latine, quia metuimus ne committamus "errores." Nequimus in nos admittere patrare plura vel pejora vitia linguae quam quae Romani ipsi perpetraverunt temporibus classicis, quod abundanter inscriptionibus et papyris et textibus comœdiarum manifestatur. Nemo umquam, ne ipse Cicero quidem, locutus est eo modo quo Cicero *scripsit* orationes suas; ac major pars litterarum latinarum non est latinitatis classicae sed latinitatis mediaevalis quae, quamquam "vulgaris" et minus elegans, majoris utilitatis, majoris facilitatis discendi, majoris propinquitatis est. Idioma resuscitare possumus sancti Augustini, patrum Ecclesiae, Vulgatae, idioma scholasticorum et mysticorum, idioma hymnorum et sermonum, idioma jurisprudentium et poetarum, idioma philosophiae et scientiae prope usque ad tempora nostra.

Item si incipiamus docere latinitatem simplicem mediaevalem, gradualiter prodeuntes ad latinitatem classicam, doceamus linguam quasi familiarem qua uti possumus immediate in lectura amoena et moderna et in dialogo cotidiano. Item, solum postquam didicerunt latinitatem simplicem discipuli poterunt aestimare latinitatem multiplicem, difficilem, elegantem auctorum classicorum.

Quomodo efficere possumus renaissance linguæ latinae?

- 1) Acceptione neologismorum;
- 2) adoptione latinitatis similis latinitati mediaevali, latinitatis minus perfectae, minus classicae, sed modernioris et facilioris;
- 3) usu constanti in litteris, documentis, chartis, sermonibus nostris;

- 4) evolutione prudenti linguae latinae qua idiomatis internationalis, semper considerantes linguam recte comprehensam linguam recte dictam—cognitio nostra auctorum classicorum et accessus facilis ad opera eorum prohibebit degenerationem totalem linguae latinae;
- 5) studio et restitutione litterarum latinorum medii aevi et temporum modernorum;
- 6) audacia nova dicendi sine metu professorum.

Lingua viva numquam est lingua philologorum et grammaticorum, et sicut vita ipsa plena est improvisorum, imperfectorum, mirabilium.

JOHANNES A. GAERTNER

Lafayette College, Pa.

Classical Articles In Non-Classical Periodicals . .

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY 33 (1950).—(September: 57-73) Edward Robertson, "Aldus Manutius, the Scholar-Printer, 1450-1515." The life of Aldus Manutius I: his education and great interest in Greek, his erudition and versatility ("He not only printed and published, he was also a bookseller. . . He was scholar, text critic, philologist, grammarian, historian of literature, moralist."), the books which he printed—their fonts and format. The fortunes of his printing house under his son Paul and grandson Aldus Manutius II. Aldines in the John Rylands Library. (Cf. also the brief notice of Aldus under the heading "Quincentenary of Aldus Manutius," pp. 2-3 of this same number.) (111-130) W. H. Semple, "Some Letters of St. Augustine." St. Augustine's correspondence with St. Jerome as an illustration of "their way of thought and the clash between their temperaments and attitudes."—34 (1951).—(September: 119-136) W. H. Semple, "Aeneas at Carthage: A Short Study of *Aeneid* I and IV." The Divine Will, "the most momentous thing in the *Aeneid*," is looking out "for the good and happiness of humanity: but more for the whole of human kind than for indi-

viduals, more for the massive totality than for persons; and if in the broad general beneficence of the plan this individual seems to be included and that one excluded, it is because the one is necessary to the heavenly policy, and the other is either unnecessary or an obstacle." Out of a new Troy, founded by Aeneas in Italy, will come the Augustan Empire, "which Virgil believes to be a consummation of the highest importance for human well-being." So the result of the Carthaginian episode is that Aeneas goes on successfully to Italy, whereas Dido perishes. (137-165) Robert B. Tate, "Italian Humanism and Spanish Historiography of the Fifteenth Century." The life and writings of Joan Margarit, cardinal bishop of Gerona (John of Gerona). The work chiefly studied here is his *Paralipomenon Hispaniae*, a history of ancient Spain to the time of Augustus. Margarit's plan to continue this to the era of Arcadius and Honorius was never carried out. "His main sources of information are gained from a detailed manipulation of Strabo, Ptolemy, Diodorus Siculus, Plutarch, Justinus's abbreviation of Trogus Pompeius, Pliny, Mela, Livy, Caesar and his abbreviators, Florus."

CAROLINA QUARTERLY 3 (1951).—(No. 3: 24-29) B. L. Ullman and Walter Allen, Jr., "A Goodly Heritage: Greek and Latin Authors in English Translation." The value of giving classics courses in translation and the problems which it presents; the difficulties involved in making or finding suitable English versions.

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE 3 (1951).—(Spring: 97-118) Arnold G. Reichenberger, "Boscán and the Classics." A study of the classicism of the sixteenth-century Spanish writer, Boscán. Particular attention is paid to his *Historia de Leandro y Hero* and how it differs in spirit from Musaeus. "What we feel today as typically Hellenic in Musaeus, the straightforwardness, the simple plastic force of Musaeus' language, together with his sensualism of Hellenistic heritage, have not been carried over into Boscán's Castilian version." Boscán's epic of Hero and Leander draws not only on Musaeus but also on the two pertinent *Heroides* of Ovid and two episodes from Vergil's *Georgics*, Book IV. (129-151) G. Hainsworth, "Un thème des romanciers naturalistes: la matrone d'Ephèse." The theme of the Matron of Ephesus as found in Flaubert, Maupassant, Daudet, and Paul Alexis; comparisons are often made with Petronius' treatment of the same theme. (152-159) A. Emerson Creore, "Ronsard, Du Bartas, and the Homeric Comparison." Ronsard and Du Bartas use the Homeric simile

both after the Homeric fashion and "in ways unknown to Homer, or in ways which were not characteristic of Homer." (160-173) Walter A. Strauss, "Albert Camus' *Caligula*: Ancient Sources and Modern Parallels." "Camus has drawn lavishly on Suetonius and has possibly consulted some of the other chroniclers of *Caligula*." Camus' *Caligula* has several points of resemblance with characters in Kafka and Dostoyevsky.

CONTEMPORARY REVIEW 180 (1951).—(September: 165-168) R. H. Ferry, "Nations of Fish-Eaters." Fish as an article of food, especially among the Greeks and the Romans. Several ancient authors are referred to, and a recipe of Apicius for cooking fish in paper (porous papyrus) is given.

DALHOUSIE REVIEW 31 (1951).—(Spring: 33-42) Burns Martin, "Aristotle's *Poetics*." Part I: the theory that the *Poetics* originated as an after-dinner speech before the Athenian Authors' Association (if this existed). Part II: the *Poetics* as a mirror "of the literary discussions and quarrels of the day." Part III (misprinted as IV): "the permanent qualities in the *Poetics*."

FRANÇAIS MODERNE 19 (1951).—(Janvier: 1-8) J. Marouzeau, "Les déficiences de la dérivation française." Notes on the four explanations which Dauzat gives for the limited use of derivatives in French; Latin and the evolution of Latin into French are naturally often mentioned. D.'s first explanation, with which Marouzeau agrees, is the more or less complete loss of the Latin suffix: e.g., of *-men* in *essai* (from *exa-men*), of *-culum* in *peril* (from *peri-culum*), of *-ticum* in *village* (from *villa-ticum*). D.'s third explanation and M.'s discussion of it both cite the rivalry between the inherited word and the later learned borrowing from Latin: e.g., *rançon* and *rédemption* (both from *redemptionem*). (23-27) Albert Dauzat et al., "Notes étymologiques." (28) Albert Dauzat, "Notes lexicologiques." The words *brabant* and *lapin* and the date of the domestication of the cat are considered here. D. had stated in 1949 that the word *cattus*, which designated the domestic cat (as opposed to *felis* 'a wild cat'), does not appear until the 4th or 5th century in Palladius. But the archaeologist C. Picard has since pointed out that the cat was domesticated in Greece c. 510 B.C. and that, as far as Italy is concerned, a mosaic at Pompeii represents a cat chasing a bird and some ducks. So it is not quite right to say, as Ernout and Meillet do in their etymological dictionary, that the domestic cat was not common in the Roman world until late; and we know that

the domestication of the cat began in Egypt. (Avril: 109-113) Fernand Letessier et R. Arveiller, "Notes lexicologiques." A discussion of the words *boutiquier*, *apothicaire*, *quinine*, and *chlorose*; new dating for the first appearance of certain words in French. Greek *apotheca* yields the learned *apotheca* in late Latin; but there must have been a parallel popular form, the ancestor of *boutique*. (114) Albert Dauzat et al., "Questions et discussions." Note spec. the account of *livre de raison*. This, and not *livre de raisons*, became established in the Middle Ages (perhaps in accordance with Livy's *liber rationis*). (Juillet: 181-186) Charles Camproux, "Déficiency et vitalité de la dérivation." The theme of Marouzeau's article cited above in the light of modern Provençal, espec. of the Gévaudan. (201-206) E. de Ullmann et al., "Notes lexicologiques." See espec. the discussion of the word *sémanique* and the dialectal forms *étrouble*, *êtreble*; though the modern concept of semantics is based on the ideas of Bréal the science of meaning was brought into the general field of linguistics a half century before him by the Latinist K. Reisig, who invented the term *semasiology*.

JOURNAL OF AESTHETICS AND ART CRITICISM 10 (1951).—(September: 26-34) Craig LaDrière, "The Problem of Plato's *Ion*." The main subject of the *Ion* is not "the poetic process" but "the question whether a scientific method is available for criticism of the poetic art." (43-52) John E. Brown, "Neo-Platonism in the Poetry of William Blake."

LANGUAGE 27 (1951).—(July-September: 223-229) George Melville Bolling, "ANTA, AN-THN, ANTI in the Homeric Poems." (October-December: 477-484) Ralph L. Ward, "Stop Plus Liquid and the Position of the Latin Accent." The author suggests "that in the Classical period the popular variants of standard Latin *manīplus*, *assēcula* were *manīplus*, *assēcla* [not *manīplus*, *assecla*], with the shorter forms getting their accent from the longer ones and continuing unaltered into literary Late Latin and into Proto-Romance. . . . Our accent rule should read: the Latin accent falls on the penult not only when that syllable is long, but also when it is short, provided that it consists of a short vowel followed by stop +6." The accentuation *manīplus* etc. would then have furnished the analogy for words with stop +7 (instead of 1); i.e., would account for the shift "from *tēnebrae*, *tōnītrus* to the *tēnebrae*, *tonītrus* called for in Proto-Romance to explain Span. *tinieblas*, Fr. *tonnerre*."

BASSETT

VADE MECUM FOR CLASSICS STUDENTS

DESPITE THE NUMEROUS handbooks and histories of Greek and Roman literature and the more profuse encyclopedias and biographical dictionaries in our libraries today at the disposal of students and teachers of the classics, there may often appear the need of a work of quick reference for Greek and Latin authors, giving, in a readily accessible form, only the name, dates and listing of the works, genuine and spurious, of the writer desired. It is surely to be doubted that within our generation, or the next few succeeding, we will have a substitute for Pauly-Wissowa, the classicist's ultimate source of authority on the ancient authors and their works. Most recently, we have seen the publication of the excellent *Oxford Classical Dictionary* listing authors and subjects in one alphabetical order. But both in the case of the virtually unpurchasable German encyclopedia and the more succinct English reference work, a quick reference—i.e., author's name, dates and works only—is often next to impossible without reading carefully the entire article, long or short, devoted to him. Furthermore, what the *Oxford Dictionary* gains in succinctness and clarity it often sacrifices in comprehensiveness, whence the searcher has ultimately to resort to Pauly-Wissowa, after all. And who can afford to own a Pauly-Wissowa?

For the quick reference I have for many years employed a source which, within my experience, appears to be relatively unknown to classics students. The reason for its unfamiliarity will be apparent when its nature and original purpose are explained. I refer to the Library of Congress classification scheme for the class PA, which denotes Greek and Latin literature. This volume, a common library cataloging tool, is but one of many wherein the Library of Congress (hereafter abbreviated as LC) classification is set forth and analyzed primarily for the benefit of classifiers at LC. But the volumes have become prime sources of reference for every large cataloging department, by reason of their masterly form analyses which are now the accepted basis of all standard cataloging.

The volume in question¹ analyzes not only Greek and Latin literature, but general and comparative philology and linguistics as well (class P), though this latter comprises only about one fifth of the entire book. The greater part of the

volume consists in alphabetical lists of some 1000 Greek authors and perhaps about half as many Latin. With virtually every author are included his exact or approximate dates, followed by a list of his works, alphabetically arranged. In all cases of major or voluminous authors there is a breakdown analysis for the classifier by editions, translations, criticism and special topics. For the classics student and teacher, however, the advantages of this volume are numerous: First, he will find immediately the author's full name and dates. Where two authors have the same or similar name, and there is any likelihood of confusion, they are carefully distinguished by the form of literature written. Secondly, there is a similar careful distinction of genuine and spurious works. In all case of doubt, references are given to Pauly-Wissowa or to the standard historians of Greek and Latin literature (e.g., as in the Müller *Handbuch* series). Finally, the scholarly analysis is carried so far beyond the obvious needs of the cataloger as to include numerous critical and explanatory notes, directing the reader either to general reference works or, as often, to special monographs on the author and work in question.

Thus, for such an author as Aesop, there are six full pages of literary analysis wherein the various ancient recensions, with their sources, are listed, followed by the long and complicated series of medieval translations, chiefly Latin. The scholarly notes and references accompanying this difficult and highly controversial author should suffice to reflect the character of the work as a whole.

When we reach the entry for Aristotle, we find first a complete listing of all works included in the Aristotelian corpus, genuine and spurious, the latter being set off with asterisks. The titles are here given in their traditional Latin forms, to be used by the cataloger in designating the works in question. Following a listing of the fragments in Greek is a relisting of all titles in the corpus in Greek with corresponding Latin translations, as found in the first list, to facilitate accurate identification. Then follows a listing of the spurious works, with Latin titles, accompanied, in many cases by critical commentaries dealing with the origin and medieval tradition of the treatises as found in Latin, Arabic or other sources, with references, in each case, to loci

classici on the subjects. The remainder of the entry for Aristotle is given over to translations, criticism and interpretation of the author.

Similar detailed analyses will be found for such prolific authors as Demosthenes, Plato, Plutarch, Lucian; or, in Latin, Cicero, Vergil, Ovid and Seneca—to name but a few.

But the volume of classification is even more valuable for the great number of minor writers mentioned, many of which may not easily be identified outside the great Pauly-Wissowa itself. In most cases these entries consist simply of the author's name and dates, with literary characteristics, if necessary to avoid ambiguity.

It should be recognized, however, that the LC classification volume is in no sense a bibliography. There is no listing of editions or translations of the authors save, occasionally, by way of reference. Names, dates, titles of works, distinction of genuine and spurious works, critical notes and references comprise the substance and value of the book. For descriptions of editions we must go to such works as Schweiger, Hoffman, Engelmann-Preuss, Klusmann, the *Bibliotheca Philologica Classica*, *L'Année Philologique* or *Klassieke Bibliographie*.² But if we would find a ready answer to such questions as: What are Hyginus's dates and works? What speeches of Demosthenes are spurious? What are included as the works of Hermes Trismegistus? What are the lost plays of Euripides?—For these and many less specialized inquiries the LC classification holds the ready answer.

As acknowledged in the preface by W. F. Koenig, Classifier in Charge, the scholar ultimately responsible for the LC classification scheme is the renowned Charles Martel, late chief of the classification division, and his successor, Clarence W. Perley. Had Martel, who himself devised the entire LC classification scheme, exerted his vast erudition no farther than as expressed in this volume, the scholarly world would assuredly stand in his debt.

As one who has used the LC classification scheme PA with untold profit for over twenty years, I feel that this indispensable volume should be found on the reference shelf of every student and teacher of the classics. Its *multum in parvo* of comprehensiveness succinctly and lucidly expressed, its scholarly authority and its inexhaustiveness all combine to make it a classical student's *vade mecum*.

SAMUEL A. IVES

Curator of Rare Books, University of Wisconsin

NOTES

¹ Classification. Class P. P-PA. Philology, Linguistic, Classical Philology, Classical Literature. Washington, U. S. Government printing office, 1928. (Price: 60¢.)

² Schweiger, Friedrich L. A.—Handbuch der klassischen Bibliographie Leipzig, Friedrich Fleischer, 1830-1834. 2 vols.

Hoffmann, Samuel F. G.—Lexicon Bibliographicum sive Index Editionum et Interpretationum Scriptorum Graecorum tum sacrorum tum profanorum. Lipsiae, J. A. C. Weigel, 1832-1836. 3 vols.

Engelmann, Wilhelm—Bibliotheca scriptorum classicorum et graecorum et latinorum . . . 8. Auflage umfassend die Literatur von 1700-1878, neu bearb. von E. Preuss. Leipzig, 1880-1882. 2 vols.

Bibliotheca philologica classica . . . Beiblatt zum Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der Klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft. Berlin, 1874—to date.

Klusmann, Rudolf—Bibliotheca scriptorum classicorum et graecorum et latinorum. Die Literatur von 1878 bis 1896 einschliesslich umfassend. Leipzig, O. R. Reisland, 1909-1913. 2 vols.

L'Année philologique, bibliographie critique et analytique de l'antiquité gréco-latine. Paris, 1924—to date. (Ed. Jules Marouzeau.)

Klassieke bibliographie. Maandlijsten van tijdschriftartikelen . . . Utrecht, 1930—to date.

Trends and Events

Edited by Dorrance S. White

We are happy to welcome Professor
William M. Seaman of Michigan State
College

GUEST EDITOR

I WANT TO TAKE this opportunity to pay tribute to the high school Latin teachers who do a splendid job generally, in many cases under great difficulties. This year my interest is more personal, since my son is studying elementary Latin with an excellent teacher. But all of us who teach on the college level ought to recognize the important work being done in secondary Latin and we should aid and co-operate with their programs.

It sometimes seems to me, however, that there is a regrettable attitude of *après moi le déluge* on the part of many college and university professors of the classics when they pay little or no attention to those public school teachers once they have left their classes, and seem to care little about what is happening to language study on the

secondary level. It really is important that all teachers today be aware of the trends in public schools and note the philosophies of education which prevail in the entire public school curriculum. You may be sure that certain other departments of the college faculty are fully conversant with what is going on.

* * *

HERE IN MICHIGAN the college and high school classicists get together annually for some sharing of experiences at the Schoolmasters' Club, which meets on the campus of the University of Michigan in April. We have a Classical Conference in which high school, parochial and college people participate. Latin problems are treated more intimately here than in the regional meetings of the Michigan Education Association, where modern languages and Latin are sometimes combined.

For the past five years in this state we have been having informal meetings annually of all the college teachers of the classics, at which we discuss mutual problems. Professor James E. Dunlap, of the University, calls the meetings and we gather on a Saturday in the fall at Michigan State College.

At this year's meeting someone suggested that high school teachers might help the Latin enrolment in colleges by passing the word on to their students that the secondary course is just a beginning and that it would be profitable to continue the language in college; that there is nothing forbidding about the college Latin course, even if the student has been away from it for two years, as so frequently is the case. We would like to point out that our college second year course takes into account this lapse of time by giving a review and by taking up Latin reading which is relatively simple.

The fact is that there is a tremendous mortality, since many a student nowadays can get only two years of Latin in high school. Then, after a lapse of two years, he feels that he has probably forgotten most of what he learned, and he supposes that college Latin must be unbelievably difficult. Many teachers with whom I have talked follow the practice of reading some simple text like Scudder's "Easy Latin," at the same time reviewing the grammar thoroughly. This builds up confidence in the student that he can read and that he remembers more than he thought.

* * *

YOU MAY BE interested in some statistics from a study made recently by Dr. Professor Stuart A. Gallacher, professor of German here. This was a survey of languages taught in the high schools of Michigan. Out of a total of 712 school curricula reporting, those now teaching a language number 398. Of these the total teaching Latin are 336, 110 of which are parochial schools. For the modern languages the totals are French, 95, Spanish, 128 and German, 15. This means that Latin is still the leading language in Michigan public schools and that where only one language is taught, it is Latin.

* * *

IN THIS so-called scientific age, there should be, although there seldom is, an emphasis upon accuracy. I believe that more weight might be given to the function of Latin as a training in the development of accurate observation and precision of expression. For example, there is an almost mathematical precision with which an idea is expressed by a verb like *vocabantur*: stem *voca*, tense sign *ba*, person and number *nt*, voice *ur*. The process of taking this word apart (analysis) or putting it together (synthesis) certainly helps a student to understand what elements are involved in a verbal expression.

In current practice in the public schools they have interesting devices for preparing a child to read. It is called the development of "reading readiness." In this process the child is given many exercises which teach him to distinguish similar forms which have only a slight differential. There will be, for example, a line of eight houses, seven having two windows, one having three. He must encircle the one that is different. Or there will be seven S's made correctly and one reversed. In the end he is to learn that words may vary by only one stroke, such as *cat* and *eat*.

Now I have found, as many teachers have, that a great many students studying language in college have not learned to make those fine distinctions. They confuse *iam* and *nam*, *dico* and *duco*, *mittit* and *mittet*, and so on. I have thought that it might be helpful to go back to first grade exercises to teach those little things. The least that I can hope to teach college students is to be precise in observation, even if they do not learn to read Cicero. This would satisfy most teachers of mathematics and science too.

THE REVIEW CUPBOARD

By Grundy Steiner

Et summis admiratio
veneratioque et
inferioribus merita
laus

REVIEWED HERE are two books which represent a wide contrast in methods of publication. The one, Diringer's *Alphabet* is in a "second and revised edition" but an edition, of the sort now rather common (see this column for February), in which only such changes could be made as would permit the use of the old plates. The other, Onians' *Origins of European Thought*, has undergone so many revisions and expansions in proof (over a seventeen year period) that it is virtually a third edition at the time of its first appearance.

The Origins of European Thought About the Body the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time, and Fate: New Interpretations of Greek, Roman, and kindred evidence, also of some basic Jewish and Christian beliefs. By R. B. Onians. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1951. Pp. xvii, 547. \$9.00.

THE TITLE presents an astounding list of topics, and the author provides a wealth of absorbing (albeit chopped up) ideas about them. The book testifies to the unremitting energy of its author who for twenty-five years could never quite allow its publication since he was always expanding or revising one or more of its sections. It testifies also to the patience and scholarly determination of the Cambridge University Press which was not daunted by the succession of revisions and supplements.

A portion of the book (mainly the study of "Fate") had in 1926 been awarded the Hare Prize by the University of Cambridge. It was submitted to the press in 1929 (ca. 272 pp.), but the author let it be set up only in 1934 (when it bulked 424 pp.). After three years in proof-correction (and the insertion of subsidiary ideas) it was re-issued in a second proof (451 pp.). A third (with three pages of addenda) and apparently the author's own indices appeared in 1939. In 1941 a third addendum was printed but a projected fourth ("Ancient Jewish Conceptions of the Mind or 'Soul' . . .") blocked further advance towards printing. Now, says the author (p. xvi), "I have had to let Addendum IV go, though I have scarcely done justice to the sub-

ject" and the Press has prepared a new and shorter set of indices. The final text of the book contains 466 pages and twelve addenda which occupy forty-seven more.

The foregoing explains why the presentation of ideas is not architectural in its neatness, but more like three great congeries of notes on related topics, followed by a dozen little piles which should have been incorporated. Yet these unkind remarks about the structure of the book should not discourage the prospective reader; the contents are calculated to hold the "man who would penetrate into prehistoric times and the beginnings of our civilisation" (p. xi).

Here are some of the principal ideas treated: In Part I ("The Mind and the Body") the author marshals cogently the evidence that to Homer and the primitive Greeks the *φρένες* are the lungs and not the diaphragm, that they are the seat of feeling and thought, that "inspiration" (p. 50) accordingly has a most logical and natural meaning in what is normally regarded as a rather figurative sense. In Part II ("The Immortal Soul and the Body") he finds that the early Greeks and Romans located the *ψυχή* and the *genius* (p. 129) in the head and that both are to be equated with "the life-spirit active in procreation, dissociated from and external to the conscious self that is centered in the chest." The further equation of the life-stuff in the head with the soft marrow of bones and the conception of the soul as fire then are taken (together or singly) to explain portrayals of love as "fire in the bones" (p. 152), the fire that played about the heads of the child Servius Tullius and the child Iulus (p. 163) as well as the concept underlying the radiate crown for kings (p. 165), and the identification of the soul of Julius with the comet (p. 163). In Part III ("Fate and Time") the image underlying *τέλεια* in numerous Homeric passages is found to be that of binding (p. 324) with the *τέλεια* as bonds; *nescessest* and "it is bound to happen" are equated semantically (pp. 332-333); and just as a *κήρυ* or *δαίμων* put the bonds of fate upon a mortal in the form of a garland (p. 402), so the garland placed on a sacrificial victim rendered it holy, and the garland

of an initiate "invested him with his new state, new fate" (p. 450).

A further catalogue of ideas would exceed the scope of this review. In short, the author never rests in connection with any one topic but is always elaborating new ideas, extending or applying old ones, or seeking alternate explanations. Many of the suggestions (some of which are not new) need much testing and examination by competent specialists before the true value of Mr. Onians' contributions can be ascertained. If they prove sound, a number of his suggestions about etymologies and semantic developments will necessitate revision of sections in the standard lexica. To suggest, e.g., (pp. 343-348) that *καῖρος* is connected with *καίρω*, that "an opening" hence "an opportunity" is the initial meaning, and that "*tempus*" (whether in its anatomical or chronological sense) is connected with the root of *templum* and *τέμνω*, again with the sense of "an opening" (the temples being the weakest point in the skull) will, if the evidence bears out the suggestion, require revisions in Liddell-Scott-Jones, Boisacq, Walde, Ernout et Meillet, and (to a lesser extent, curiously) in Lewis and Short.

Now much of the value of this work lies in the details. This brings up a sad point: the indices are woefully inadequate. The "General Index" fortunately catches most major details (even for the footnotes) but the "Index of Words" is very incomplete and the "Select Index of Passages" seems really a "random index" although the "General Index" compensates for some deficiencies. To illustrate: Aen. 2.680-691 is discussed on p. 163. The only citation in the index for Aen. 2 is line 101. The discussion must be found through the "General Index" s. v. "Fire: . . . manifestation of genius," or s. v. "Genius: . . . associated with blushing and burning of the brain or head . . ." A second deficiency is the absence of a general bibliography.

In sum, while the organization of this book leaves much to be desired, the evidence is marshalled well in support of the linguistic suggestions, many of which seem to make good sense in context as one reads with them in mind. Some will need revision or more support to gain acceptance. But meanwhile teachers and researchers alike who are interested in etymologies and folklore will want the book at hand as they read Homer, Pindar, the tragedians, Plautus, Catullus, Vergil, Petronius and numerous others; for Mr. Onians' suggestions throw light on many passages and are going to be dangerous to ignore.

The Alphabet: A Key to the History of Mankind. By David Diringer. 2d and Rev. Ed. New York: Philosophical Library [1951]. Pp. 607, 256 figs. \$12.00.

THIS EDITION is little changed from its predecessors. The text has been altered in a few spots and insertions have been made in the bibliographies at the ends of some of the chapters. Had the earlier editions been reviewed in *CJ* this is all that would need be said.

In between the introduction and the general bibliography and index, the book falls into two major parts: first, "Non-Alphabetic Systems of Writing" (e.g. cuneiform hieroglyphic, Cretan, Chinese, Mayan, Aztec) and second, "Alphabetic Scripts" (e.g. South Semitic, Aramaic, Indian, Greek, Etruscan, Runic, Latin). The plates give at least one illustration for nearly every type of script considered. The results make for excellent browsing.

There is need for such a handbook; but the most serious question is whether any one man can, by himself, safely attempt to prepare it. Inevitably much of the information has to be at second and third hand and in some sections of the field (which is really the world) the compiler must be dogged by a paucity of any except dubious authorities.

The plates, which are one of the chief riches (and items of expense, no doubt) in the book, are often actually less than satisfactory. Many specimens are likely to be packed into one figure and the reference numbers tucked inconsistently into random corners. (See e.g. Fig. 195 and especially Fig. 197 into which ten Greek inscriptions are crowded with reference numbers sometimes to the left, sometimes to the right, sometimes above, and sometimes below the specimen, and where specimen 7 is actually inside specimen 8.) Again, sometimes the scripts are transcribed and sometimes not (e.g. in Figs. 245 and 247 the samples of Latin scripts are transcribed, although most might be read by the amateur, while the Pompeian tablets in Fig. 244, which are less than obvious, and the Merovingian and Irish scripts of Fig. 246 are without transcription). This variation probably stems from Dr. Diringer's sources and is likely to be found in any work "at second hand" unless a writer fights desperately to achieve consistency. And, in this connection, it is not clear at first sight which sounds in the unnumbered chart on p. 447 go with which symbols in Fig. 195.7. (Apparently the first symbol is "bā", the next two are both "boa," etc.) The whole section on the

"Woleai Syllabary(?)" illustrates vividly the difficulties in dealing with second-hand and scantily attested material.

A casual sampling reveals certain peculiarities in English, e.g. "it has been adapted only about 15 years ago" (p. 418) and "its eighth edition has been published . . . in 1941" (p. 132) where an English preterite would have been more natural. And the following misprints were noted in browsing: on p. 80 read "Mylonas" for "Mylonos"; p. 299 (Fig. 139.4), "saying" for "saiying"; p. 534, "Sulla" for "Silla," and p. 538, "Spurius" for "Spurious."

But despite these and other failings inevitable in an ambitious undertaking like this, Dr.

Diringer (and his publishers) deserve thanks for having made available in compact form the materials here assembled. The work will undoubtedly stand, despite adverse criticisms from specialists in particular areas,¹ as the reference handbook of the subject until that fine day when a committee of true specialists, each capable of handling the needful sources as king in his own domain, will be assembled to prepare the definitive work on all the systems of writing in the wide world.

NOTE

¹ For a review which raises objections to certain sections on Runes, etc., see that by Kemp Malone in *AJP* 72 (1951) 108-110.

BOOK REVIEWS

Gods, Graves, and Scholars. By C. W. Ceram. Translated by E. B. Garside. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1951. Pp. 426. 32 Plates (with maps and illustrations). \$5.75.

[*En. Note:* This review of a book currently riding eighth on the list of non-fiction best sellers is printed here through the courtesy of the editors of *CW* for whom it was originally prepared.]

IN HIS *Gods, Graves, and Scholars*, C. W. Ceram's aim is "to portray the dramatic qualities of archaeology, its human side." In presenting a panorama of great archaeological discoveries which lead the reader through five millennia of exciting history, he chooses the medium best qualified to play up the drama behind the excavator's spade: the story of the men who undertook the excavations.

The author (whose real name is Kurt W. Marek) purposely elects to present excavations not in chronological order, but according to the cultural arena where they occurred. For, in this manner, he claims to achieve "an almost spontaneously created picture of four closed cultural provinces." These very important cultures are described in the books entitled "The Book of the Statues," "The Book of the Pyramids," "The Book of the Towers," and "The Book of the Temples." Part V, "Books That Cannot Yet Be Written," implies that, although we know much about the Hittite, the Indus, and the Inca cultures, there is not yet enough definite archaeological literature on these subjects to allow condensation into "books" such as the above.

Of the sites discussed in Book I, Pompeii is, in this reviewer's opinion, not sufficiently treated. Nor is Winckelmann made to stand out as clearly as he should. But it is a different story with Schliemann at Mycenae and Troy. "Carrying his belief in Homer before him like a banner" (p. 35), he emerges as the veritable "hero" of the entire book. Indeed, he and Evans are at the head of those excavators who have had the supreme pleasure of seeing, through their efforts, "the kernel of a legend historically validated."

If the story of Schliemann reads like a fairy-tale, then the story of Champollion is, in some ways, even more remarkable. This young genius, though French by birth, actually looked like an Oriental; during his lifetime everything he undertook seemed in some way related to ancient Egypt. At a very early age, he mastered several Oriental languages, in addition to Latin and Greek. He even compiled a Coptic dictionary for his own use. As a boy, Schliemann had said that he would someday find Troy; the young Champollion, when he first saw some hieroglyphic inscriptions, announced that he would read them when he grew up. But it was all of sixty-four years after his death before he received due recognition for having done most toward solving the mysteries of the Rosetta Stone. Indeed, his work prepared the way for a thorough appreciation of the new science of Egyptology which was to develop through the efforts of Belzoni, Lepsius, Mariette, and Petrie. The story of Belzoni, at one time a circus strong-man, reads like the adventures in some bizarre novel.

Of the four cultures treated in this book, three left visible evidence of past grandeur, such as the colossal monuments of Egypt, the temples of Greece and Rome, and the sacrificial stone blocks of Middle America. Not so with Assyria, Babylonia, and Sumeria. For this reason, says Ceram, and rightly, "... the archaeological conquest in this arena was particularly memorable" (p. 210). Among the notable figures dealt with by the author are Botta, the French consul who discovered Nineveh and paved the way for archaeological investigations in Assyria; Rawlinson, who was in the employ of the Persian War Ministry when he risked his life to copy the famous Behistun trilingual inscriptions; Grotefend, the school-teacher who deciphered the first ten letters of a cuneiform script to win a bet from his drinking companions; Smith, the translator of the Gilgamesh Epic, who was a professional banknote-engraver and an amateur archaeologist before he became an assistant in the British Museum; and Sir Leonard Woolley who excavated the great prehistoric cemetery at Ur.

Mr. Ceram disarms even captious criticism in his *Foreword* when he says that "... simple factual mistakes have undoubtedly crept into the text." One of these is not wholly his fault, for when he says (p. 126) that Ikhnaton named his new city Tell-el-Amarna (the modern Arabic name), he is merely repeating a common error: the original name was Akhetaten. Since Professor Breasted did not die until 1935, and since Sir Alan Gardiner is still living, it is not correct to say (p. 204), that "by 1930 Howard Carter was the only one still alive of the group that had worked on the tomb" [of Tutankhamen]. On page 303, Sir Leonard Woolley is wrongly referred to as "Arthur" Woolley.

The author could not possibly cover all excavations, but it is perhaps not too much to wish that some reference would have been made to the work on the Athenian Agora. Also Bingham's discovery of Machu Picchu, the lost city of the Incas, certainly holds enough romantic adventure to be mentioned in such a work.

The maps in the book are very helpful, as well as the Chronological Tables. The Bibliography is more than adequate. I might call attention to some recent volumes which are of interest: *A Hundred Years of Archaeology* (London, 1950), by Glen E. Daniel; two illuminating accounts of Mesopotamian archaeology, *Foundations in the Dust* (1947), by Seton Lloyd, and *Archéologie Mésopotamienne: Les Étapes* (Paris, 1946), by André Parrot. Of interest to the layman are the

following: *Archäologische Entdeckungen im XX. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1931), by F. Oppeln-Bronikowski; *The Splendour that was Egypt* (London, 1949), by Margaret A. Murray; and *The Lost Pharaohs* (New York, 1951), by Leonard Cottrell.

Gods, Graves, and Scholars has well deserved its popularity with the reading public. It has admirably filled the aim of its author; moreover, it capitalizes on the element of suspense so expertly that it demands reading until the conclusion is reached. Some of the book's charm lies in its style and word-pictures. But is it not catering too much to popular taste to call Homer "the first war correspondent" (pp. 33-34)?

When the reader closes the book, he will have learned enough to agree with the author, when he says (p. 20), "... archaeology is everybody's concern and is not in the least an esoteric special branch of science. When we busy ourselves with archaeology, life as a whole has become our subject. For life is not an occasional, partial affair, but a constant balancing on the point of intersection where past and future meet."

FRANCIS D. LAZENBY

University of Illinois

Studies Presented to David Moore Robinson on His Seventieth Birthday. Edited by G. E. MYLONAS. Volume I. Washington University, Saint Louis, 1951. Text: pp. lix+876; 100 figs.+111 plates.

FOR NEARLY half a century Professor David M. Robinson has been a great force in the Classical scholarship of this country. A scholar of extraordinary productivity, he has made significant contributions to the study of ancient history, epigraphy, Greek and Roman literature, and Classical archaeology as well as to many other fields. As organizer and administrator he has been prominent in many Classical organizations, in associations concerned with the welfare of modern Greece, and in the founding stage of the College Art Association. As *prostates* of a flourishing school of Classical archaeologists at Johns Hopkins, he has trained several generations of students. As excavator, he participated in several major enterprises and culminated this phase of his career by the discovery and comprehensive publication of Olynthus, the site which has become fundamental for our knowledge of the Greek city in the Classical Age. Achievements of such dimensions called for a monumental acknowledgment and this is now on hand in the first volume of the *Studies Presented to David*

Moore Robinson. It is an impressive tribute and one for which the editor, Professor George E. Mylonas, deserves a rising vote of thanks. No detail has been overlooked that makes a *Festschrift* complete. A picture of the scholar honored and a bios of Professor Robinson from the pen of Professor Mylonas make the beginning; a complete bibliography of Professor Robinson's writings follows. His teaching activity is reflected in the list of all students who took their degrees under him—an imposing roster leading into all aspects of Classics and many other fields. International acclaim is implied in the numerous articles sent by scholars of many nations. The volume under review contains articles on prehistoric archaeology, architecture, and sculpture; a second volume, which will be eagerly awaited, is to include articles on vase painting as well as those on philological, historical, and literary subjects.

As always with *Festschriften*, a reviewer faces the invidious task of selecting somewhat arbitrarily from the great array—a task that nothing short of reprinting the table of contents can obviate. I should like to assure the prospective readers that there is a great deal more in the volume than what I mention and to admonish them to sample for themselves the opulent fare spread out for the students of Classics in honor of Professor Robinson.

Among the Prehistoric articles, the readers of this Journal may be interested in J. Bérard's attempt to raise the dates for the Trojan War and the Dorian Invasion, and in the articles on the dance in ancient Crete (L. M. Lawler) and the cult of the dead in Helladic times (G. E. Mylonas). For students of Greek architecture and Greek theatre J. B. Dinsmoor's authoritative opinion on the development of the Athenian theatre of Dionysus in the fifth century is a must. S. Markmann contributes a serviceable review of the earliest Greek houses and temples. H. Riemann tries to establish a law in the proportions of the plans of archaic Doric temples. P. Verzone seeks to show the influence of bronze ornaments upon architectural ornaments. W. A. McDonald presents the interesting conjecture that the opulent "Villa of Good Fortune" in Olynthus was an inn—with gambling facilities. Among the articles on Egypt and the Near East is an enlightening essay on curricula and methods in Sumerian schools.

In Greek sculpture and related arts, there is a splendid article by S. P. Karousou on Attic mirrors with female figures as supports, a major contribution to our knowledge of archaic and Classical Greek bronzes. The working methods of

Greek sculptors receive some interesting sidelights from articles by G. Kaschnitz-Weinberg and F. Brommer. The former argues that the second of the Kleobis-Biton twins was made by an Eastern Greek sculptor after the model by Polymedes; the latter investigates the instances in which Greek sculptors appear to have copied or duplicated their own work. C. Weickert publishes a fine fragment of an archaic Gorgoneion. F. Magi reports the fortunate discovery and subsequent reintegration of the lower part of the beautiful athlete stele in the Vatican. G. Lippold contributes new interpretations of reliefs concerned with healing snakes, while M. Bieber suggests that the ephedrimos group from the Agora excavations should be interpreted as "Clouds."

An article by E. Kunze on Etruscan bronzes found in Greece enlarges our knowledge of the commerce between archaic Greece and Italy. Greek influence in Italy is also the subject of E. Sjöqvist's ingenious comparison of the Roman comitium with the Athenian Pryx. Revolutionary ideas on Roman chronology under the Kings and during the Early Republic are presented by E. Gjerstad in his discussion of the Agger of Servius Tullius. The *oecus Aegyptiacus* of Vitruvius is illustrated from Herculaneum (A. Maiuri) and houses of Ostia are classified by A. Boethius. Plato's circular city is the starting point of an interesting survey of "round" city plans by H. P. L'Orange. Important new material on Roman architecture is to be found in the article by the late W. von Massow on the city plan of Roman Trier and in A. von Gerkan's account of the excavations which have disclosed a Constantinian church within St. Gereon in Cologne. Roman sculpture, too, benefits by publication of important new material. F. Brown unveils a new copy of the portrait of Pompey which is certainly earlier than the Claudian copy in Ny Carlsberg. J. H. Iliffe publishes a powerful statue of a running bearded man found at Philadelphia (Amman) which he tentatively interprets as Salmoneus. The workmanship is Antonine, the inspiration Pergamene. G. M. A. Richter detects a second Aspasios among the gem-cutters, one who made a portrait in the time of Hadrian. Altogether, over one hundred articles on Prehistoric, Minoan, Mycenaean, Egyptian, Near Eastern, Greek, Roman, Early Christian, and Byzantine art and archaeology are included in this volume.

In times like these it is a rare thing to see a scholarly enterprise carried out not only on a

grand scale but also in a short time. Professor Robinson may well be pleased with this first instalment of the magnificent offering in his honor; the volume will undoubtedly call the attention of the scholarly world to the entire project and secure for it the support needed for its successful completion.

GEORGE M. A. HANFMANN

Harvard University

The Epicureanism of Titus Pomponius Atticus.

By ROBERT J. LESLIE. Columbia University Dissertation, Privately Printed. Philadelphia: 1950. Pp. vii, 76. \$1.50.

THE NATURE of the extant evidence has led Dr. Leslie to attempt to determine the quality and extent of Atticus' Epicureanism by projecting what is known of his activities and attitudes against the ethical teachings of Epicurus. Though a new interpretation of the life of Atticus does emerge from the study, his final answer to the problem he poses seems to be *non liquet*. "From these three sources arose that practical philosophy which though much strained and adapted, seems to the writer to deserve the name 'Roman Epicureanism,'" (p. 73).

Had Dr. Leslie explained more clearly what he meant by Roman Epicureanism and examined more closely the strange outbreak of political activity on the part of Roman Epicureans at this time, his conclusions would have been more convincing. The names of some of the modern scholars who have done much to clarify this problem are missing from the bibliography.

WILLIAM C. GRUMMEL

University of Washington

Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, vol. XIX: New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949. Pp. v, 145; 11 plates.

ALTHOUGH THIS VOLUME came to the reviewer belatedly, its merits demand a brief notice to call it to the attention of those who may not regularly read this series. The volume contains important articles which reflect credit on the abilities of the Classical scholars of the United States.

The first article, both original and ingenious, strikes out into new territory. L. R. Taylor and T. R. S. Broughton, in "The Order of the Two Consuls' Names in the Yearly Lists," demonstrate, within the limits permitted them by the evidence, the high probability that in the Republic there was monthly alternation of the fasces between the two consuls, and that the consul elected first normally held the fasces in the odd months of the year and had his name appear first in the official lists.

In "The 'Campanian' Origin of Cn. Naevius and its Literary Attestation," H. T. Rowell undertakes a complete study of the sources of information for Naevius' life, and decides that Naevius was Capuan in origin and that our knowledge of Naevius' life ultimately derives almost exclusively from Varro.

M. Hammond reexamines in detail the evidence for the tribunician day from Domitian through Antoninus. He maintains, against Mattingly's contention that the tribunician day was stabilized on December 10 by Antoninus in 147, that such a procedure may really have been begun by Trajan in 98. The evidence of military diplomas is shown to be less reliable than that of coin series.

Mrs. Ryberg, in a discussion of "The Procession of the Ara Pacis," observes that the processional relief is, in Roman imperial sculpture, "the first presentation in sculptured relief of real persons—in part at least identifiable personages—participating in a ceremony on a specific occasion, represented in garb and mien appropriate to the actual event, but idealized in portrayal and thus lifted from the level of everyday realism to a realm where historical incident, ritual form, and artistic harmony are fused." Perhaps the most interesting of the points expounded is the suggestion that the sacrificial procession on the inner altar represents an offering to Pax, preceded by sacrifices to Janus and Jupiter. In an Appendix Mrs. Ryberg presents the further conjecture, on the basis of these ritual associations of Pax with Janus Geminus and Jupiter, that the third closing of the gates of Janus may have taken place at the same time as the constitution of the Ara Pacis in 13 B.C.

J. H. Oliver, writing "On Edict II and the Senatus Consultum at Cyrene," considers the palaeographical aspect of the problems of portions of SEG, IX, 8. "The stonemason . . . drew or painted the inscription on the stone before he cut the letters," a method which accounts for some errors and some corrections, and which also suggests a technique for the modern approach to vexed passages and lacunae. In addition, the author enters into the controversy as to the procedure indicated by the *senatus consultum* in regard to cases *de repetundis*.

A. W. Van Buren publishes "A Selection from the Antiquities at the American Academy in Rome," i.e., an impasto bull and two impasto jars of the first iron age in central Italy; four clay lamps of the Roman Empire, of which two reflect Greek relief sculpture, one the tradition of painting, while the fourth represents two men engaged in a board game; and a lead stamp whose type of workmanship indicates that it is a sample of the

result of multiple production. Mr. Van Buren's publication of these varied objects is, of course, exemplary, while each of the objects has some curious aspect to commend it to the attention of even the less archaeologically minded.

C. W. Mendell, in a full discussion of the manuscripts of Tacitus' minor works, principally undertakes to disprove that the MS from which come the *Agricola* leaves of the Codex Aesinas is the Hersfeldensis. Enlarging upon a note by H. Bloch in CP 36 (1941) 185-187, Mr. Mendell concludes that the Aesinas *Agricola* was once at Monte Cassino and was there used by Petrus Diaconus.

WALTER ALLEN, JR.

The University of North Carolina

The Greeks. By H. D. F. KITTO. (Pelican Books. A220). Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1951. Pp. 256. \$0.65.

PROFESSOR KITTO is already well-known for his book on Greek Tragedy, originally published a dozen years ago, with its forceful, broad, and sometimes acrid criticisms of the views of others. One recalls, however, that the second edition of the same book, which appeared in 1950, contains no less sharp censure on certain points of the first edition. Mr. Kitto apparently believes in self-criticism. The same author has contributed also a graceful humanistic travel book entitled *In the Mountains of Greece*.

It was thus a man of varied and proven talents who set himself the task of treating the character of the Greek people within the limited compass afforded by the current series, and of finding an

approach other than the orthodox assessment of cultural achievement.

All this was a large order, especially when it became evident to the author that his story must be told against a background of political history. Spartan methods of compression were indicated, and Mr. Kitto chose to achieve his end, partly by closing his story with Alexander and partly by omitting almost entirely certain large areas of Greek achievement, for instance, art. The decision was doubtless wise, especially the former part, but inevitably one is aware of a certain imbalance in the final result.

Thus it is only in Chapter X, three-fifths of the way through the book, that it is possible, with a brief survey of the history of the Greeks now in hand, to "pause and survey the character of the Greek mind and some of its achievements." Be it said, however, that that promise is amply fulfilled, and by literary allusion, philosophic analysis, and mathematical illustration a refreshingly new picture of the mental outlook of Greece over the greater part of the Classical period is presented quickly and cogently. It is, perhaps, in individual chapters, treated as scholarly essays, such as those on "Homer," "The Decline of the Polis," "The Greek Mind," or "Life and Character" that the author most effectively accomplishes his purpose. Balance these more significant studies against such chatty, but illuminating, passages as the comparison of the genius of Greek, Latin, and English every-day speech (pp. 26-28), and the total effect becomes pleasingly vivid. The examination of the Greek mind is the sum and substance of the whole study.

HERBERT N. COUCH

Brown University

AN APPEAL

PROFESSOR FRANCIS R. WALTON of the University of Chicago informs us that aid is requested for Dr. Tatiana Warscher, the Pompeian archaeologist, who is now, at the age of 71, nearly destitute. Herself a victim of the Russian revolution, in which her husband was killed, she risked her own life during the German occupation of Rome by giving shelter to victims of Nazism, and for several years she generously shared her slender resources with a family of Rumanian refugees. She is still actively engaged in work on her great photographic record of Pompeii, the *Corpus Typologicum Pompeianum*. All so far prepared is now being made available in microfilm by Professor C. Bradford Welles of Yale University, but the income from sales is barely sufficient to cover the costs of her materials. For the necessities of

life she is increasingly dependent on the support of her American friends, many of whom have in times past enjoyed her hospitality and profited by her rich and detailed knowledge of Pompeii. Individual gift parcels of food and used clothing (of any sort) are most welcome, and may be sent to her direct at Via David Silvagni 4, Roma 8-18, Italy. It is hoped, however, that many of her friends and others will wish also to assist in providing her with a modest Social Pension. Contributions for this may be sent to Professor Walton at the University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Illinois, and will be forwarded as received, anonymously or not as the donors may prefer. Since the need is a continuing one, regular donations, however small, are particularly desirable, but single or occasional gifts will of course be most gratefully received.

Opportunities for Teachers

Many such opportunities, owing to our current difficulties, have not been adequately noticed. Such are: the conference at the *State University of Iowa* in April, featuring especially Lillian B. Lawler, Editor of the *Classical Outlook*; the elaborate *University of Kentucky* foreign language conference, the classics section of which had on its program—among many others—Louis E. Lord, Ortha L. Wilner, Mary V. Braginton, William M. Seaman, and John F. Latimer with Jonah W. D. Skiles as Director of the entire conference. We call attention to the advertisements of the pioneer Institute on the Teaching of Latin at the *College of William and Mary* under A. Pelzer Wagener, and of the Latin Workshop at *De Paul University*, Chicago, well-attended last year under the direction of Father Richard B. Sherlock, C.M. The summer workshop at the *University of Michigan*, in line with the Course in Linguistic Science offered at *The William Penn Charter School* earlier, is run as a course parallel to considerable spread of courses in the regular summer school. (Formal announcement of this appears below.) We note the seventh annual refresher course at the *University College, London*, late in February; and the thirtieth summer school of *ARLT* (the English group in advanced methods) to be held late in September at Cambridge. And we must never forget the opportunities offered by the *American Academy in Rome*, further advertisement of which was prevented by schedule difficulties. It is expected that, with the enlargement of the functioning staff of the *Journal* to include an advertising manager especially an editor for secondary schools (with also an abatement of our present emergency), adequate representation of all such matters will hereafter appear at the proper times.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Ten classics teachers representing a cross section of American schools and colleges have been awarded Carnegie grants to study a new method of teaching Latin this summer at the University of Michigan.

Financed by \$25,000 from the Carnegie Corporation for a two-summer project, this inaugural group will form a nucleus for the Latin Teachers' Workshop, a special new feature of Michigan's Classical Studies Program.

This course will be a part of the summer linguistic program at the University of Michigan which is organized under the direction of Prof. Albert H. Marckwardt of the Department of English.

The workshop course will be under the direction of Dr. Waldo E. Sweet, visiting faculty member. It will offer the teaching profession an opportunity to profit directly from Dr. Sweet's modernization of Latin teaching methods, as evolved in four years of experimentation at the William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia, Pa.

Although the course is open to all teachers, those in the selected group each summer will receive a stipend to cover tuition and living expenses plus an additional sum for equipment to carry out the new plan in their own institutions.

A national committee of educators made the following selections for 1952: Miss Clara W. Ashley, Newton, Mass. High School; Mrs. Margaret M. Forbes, University of Minnesota; Rev. Charles H. Heckert, Northeast Catholic High School, Philadelphia; Stanford M. Miller, City College, Los Angeles; Heinz J. Otto, Blake School, Hopkins, Minn.; Mrs. Gerda Seligson, Brearley School, New York City; Miss Myra Uhlfelder, Sweet Briar College, Va.; Dr. Laura B. Voelkel, Mary Washington College, Va.; Richard H. Walker, Bronxville, N. Y. Senior High School; Miss Elizabeth White, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa. Junior High School.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

June 27-July 17

An able faculty and attractive program are provided here. W. C. Carr, dean of Latin methods leaders; two attractive members of the University staff, Chairman Agard and Prof. MacKendrick; on the high school side

the well-known Esther Weightman; these comprise the force. Agard, always lucid and interesting at this, gives a series of evening lectures. There is a laboratory course in methods and courses in Roman life and literature and in Caesar; in the last all of the *Gallie War* will be read, partly in Latin, partly in English, with slides and other illustrative matter.

Register by mail or on June 30 when the fee of \$37.50 is due with Paul MacKendrick, Bascom Hall, Madison 6. Room and board in the "Latin Quarter" available at \$57.80 for the session. Write soon to S. Lee, Director of Residence Halls, U. of W., Madison 6.

The Workshop carries (if credit is desired) 2 hours in either Latin or Education. It may be integrated with a full summer school program for those who desire that.

CLASSICS, HARVARD SUMMER SCHOOL

The Harvard Summer School will include in its 1952 program a large selection of courses in Classics and related subjects. All these courses will be offered during the eight-week Arts and Sciences session (July 1-August 23), and each course will carry four units of academic credit. Students not wishing academic credit may enroll in any of the courses as auditors, or on a non-credit basis which entitles the student to participate in all classroom discussions but does not permit him to take the final examination or receive a grade. The courses are as follows, all by Harvard professors:

Ancient Art; Associate Professor George M. A. Hanfmann.

Greek for Beginners; Assistant Professor Cedric H. Whitman.

Greek Literature: Readings in Selected Prose Authors; Assistant Professor Cedric H. Whitman.

New Aspects of the Minoan, Greek, and Roman Civilizations; Professor Sterling Dow.

Sources and Growth of Western Humanism; Professor Eric A. Havelock.

Readings in Latin Prose and Poetry: Cicero and Ovid; Mr. Milman Parry.

Virgil: Selected Reading; Professor Eric A. Havelock.

History of Ancient Philosophy; Professor John D. Wild and Associate Professor Henry D. Aiken.

For additional information about these courses and about the Summer School program generally, write directly to the Harvard Summer School, 2-L Weld Hall, Cambridge 38, Massachusetts.

1952 CLASSICAL SUMMER SCHOOL AT CUMAE, ITALY

The Vergilian Society of America, currently being revived and reorganized under the Presidency of Prof. George D. Hadzits, has had the good fortune to obtain from the Italian Government a lease on a fine large estate at Cumae, near Naples, which can admirably serve as living and study quarters for classics teachers and students who wish to spend some weeks in that richly Vergilian and classical area.

Plans and arrangements are now being made to conduct a valuable program of summer studies and travel during July and August of this year, for the benefit of American teachers and advanced students of classics, history, and art. Members will board and lodge at the estate, and be given special lectures, by such eminent authorities as Professors Maiuri, Elia, Sestieri, Mustilli, at the main classical sites: Cumae, Naples Museum, Pompeii, Herculaneum, Capri, Baiae, Puteoli, etc. The Program will cover about two weeks, and be repeated as often as enrolment warrants throughout the summer. Expenses will be moderate. A unique opportunity for gaining valuable personal background and inspiration for better teaching, combined with a memorable trip and convenient living arrangements. Members of the Summer School at the American Academy in Rome will be able to take in this program after finishing in Rome, then sail for home from Naples.

Teachers or graduate students who think they might wish to attend this Classical Summer School at the Villa Vergiliana in Cumae should contact Rev. Raymond V. Schoder, S.J., at West Baden College, West Baden Springs, Indiana, from whom they will receive more detailed information on cost, dates, and program as soon as definite arrangements have been made.

LINGUISTICS AND TEACHING ELEMENTARY LATIN

President Harlan Hatcher of the University of Michigan and Headmaster John F. Gummere of The William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia, have jointly announced a grant of approximately \$25,000 from the Carnegie Corporation to provide special opportunities for the study of the linguistic approach to Latin in the next two summers.

In each of the summers of 1952 and 1953, ten teachers of Classics from school or college may be granted stipends of \$700 each for study in the Linguistic Program at the University of Michigan under Dr. Waldo E. Sweet, lecturer in Linguistics in the Michigan Summer Session and a member of the faculty of The William Penn Charter School. Dr. Sweet's course will deal with the application of the principles of linguistic science to the practical teaching situation; he will also give a seminar in the preparation of audio-

visual materials. Dr. Sweet, who has for several years been studying new linguistic methods of language teaching, spent the summers of 1950 and 1951 in study and work on teaching materials at the University of Michigan.

Each recipient of a grant may also receive \$200 to purchase equipment for giving the course in his own institution, while materials to the value of some \$80 will be furnished.

The grant also includes a teaching fellowship in the Classics for the year 1952-53 at The William Penn Charter School. The holder of this fellowship will assist Dr. Sweet in demonstration teaching and in preparation and revision of materials.

Though the course at the University of Michigan will be open to all interested teachers, the grant will assure a nucleus of highly qualified instructors who will be able, by the terms of the grant, to continue the experiment in their own institutions during the next year or two.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND

At the Forty-sixth Annual Meeting of the Classical Association of New England, held at the Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H., March 21 and 22, 1952, the following were elected officers for 1952-53: *President*, Professor Thomas Means of Bowdoin College; *Vice-President*, Miss Dorothy Rounds of the Arlington (Mass.) High School; *Secretary-Treasurer* and *Representative on the Council of the American Classical League*, Professor F. Stuart Crawford of Boston University; *additional members of the Executive Committee*, Miss Mildred I. Goudy of the Crosby High School, Waterbury, Conn., Dr. Allan S. Hoey of the Hotchkiss School, Professor Claude W. Barlow of Clark University, and Miss Jane W. Perkins of the Brookline (Mass.) High School.

It was announced that the Association's scholarship for study at the 1952 Summer Session of the School of Classical Studies of the American Academy in Rome had been awarded

to Miss Rebecca E. Satterlee of the North Haven (Conn.) Junior High School.

It was voted to accept the cordial invitation of Deerfield Academy to hold the next Annual Meeting there on March 20-21, 1953.

Eastern Massachusetts

The forty-fifth Annual Joint meeting of the Eastern Massachusetts Section of the Classical Association of New England and the Classical Club of Greater Boston was held at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, on Saturday, February 9, 1952 at 10 A.M. The program was as follows: A Word of Welcome, Mr. Cecil T. Derry, President of the Association; "The Universalism of Alexander the Great," Professor Charles A. Robinson, Jr., Brown University; "The Desert Fathers of Egypt," Professor Claude W. Barlow, Clark University; "Roman Britain," Professor Eunice Work, Wheaton College; "The Roman Imperial Reliefs Discovered Near the Palazzo della Cancelleria" (illustrated), Professor Dietmar Thimne, Wellesley College.

TOLSTOY

(from page 210)

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 69-70. I am very grateful to Professor Charles C. Microw for calling my attention to the fact that Jean Jacques Rousseau and Friedrich Nietzsche also deliberately inflicted burns on themselves in imitation of Gaius Mucius Scaevola.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 126-127.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 128-129.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 131.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 136.

⁸ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 132.

⁹ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 132.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 135.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 136.

¹² *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 152.

¹³ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 152.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 173.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 19.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 280.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 198.

¹⁸ S. L. Tolstoy, *The Diaries of Sofya Andreyevna Tolstoy* (Leningrad, 1928-1929), Vol. I, p. 33.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 33-34.

²⁰ *CJ*, 32, 491-492.

²¹ Biryukov, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 171.

²² *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 171-173. A *kumys* cure consisted in drinking fermented mare's milk.

²³ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 174.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 265.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 119.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 317.

²⁷ S. L. Tolstoy, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 34.

²⁸ L. N. Tolstoy, *Works* (Moscow, 1911), Vol. III, p. 36.

²⁹ Biryukov, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 436-440.

³⁰ L. N. Tolstoy, *Works* (Moscow, 1911), Vol. XIII, pp. 79-393.

³¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. XIII, pp. 517-717.

³² *Ibid.*, Vol. XIII, pp. 394-516.

³³ S. L. Tolstoy, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 181.

³⁴ L. N. Tolstoy, *Works* (Moscow, 1893), Vol. XII, pp. 515-550.

³⁵ Biryukov, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 438-489; Vol. II, pp. 167-193.

³⁶ L. N. Tolstoy, *Works* (Moscow, 1893), Vol. IV, p. 19.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 20.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 104.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 127.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, Vol. XII, p. 264.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, Vol. XII, p. 353.

⁴² L. N. Tolstoy, *Works* (Moscow, 1911), Vol. XIII, p. 699.

⁴³ S. L. Tolstoy, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 110, 112, 114, 121.

⁴⁴ A. S. Prugavin, *On Lvov Tolstoy and the Tolstoies* (Moscow, 1911), p. 254.

AGAMEMNON

(from page 218)

Praise or blame,

Even as ye list,—I reck not of your words.

Lo, at my feet lies Agamemnon slain,

My husband once—and him this hand of mine,

A right contriver, fashioned for his death.

Behold the deed!

(Morshead tr., from Oates and O'Neill, *Complete Greek Drama*)

H. L. TRACY

Queen's University, Kingston, Canada

ANTIGONE

(from page 221)

⁶ *Philosophie der Religion*, zweiter Teil, herausgegeben von Georg Lasson, S. 156 (Leipzig, 1927.)

⁷ *Greek Tragedy*, page 140 (Boston, 1928). See also C. M. Bowra (*Sophoclean Tragedy*, page 93; Oxford, 1944), who comments thus on the first burial that Antigone performed for Polynices: "For Antigone it was mainly a private duty, but when the Guard finds a little dust scattered on the body, he thinks the rite has been paid to avoid the pollution that the unburied corpse may bring (256). Antigone's action does something to avert this, but she is foiled in her attempt because Creon orders the body to be uncovered." The meaning of Bowra's statement seems to be that Antigone buried her brother because it was her private duty as a sister to do so, and because she wanted to avoid the guilt of pollution incurred by one who passed by an unburied corpse without throwing dust on it. To say that Antigone's action was merely a private duty is to imply that she was at liberty to do as she pleased, and she pleased to bury her brother. We are concerned here rather with something far more important than a private duty. As Jebb (*Sophocles, The Antigone*, xxv) says, "Antigone is fulfilling one of the most sacred and the most imperative duties known to Greek religion." The import of Bowra's observation on the danger of pollution from an unburied corpse is that Antigone buried Polynices the second time, in order to avoid this danger. This statement can be challenged, on the ground that Sophocles distinctly says that the first burial was complete (245), and all of his commentators echo his statement (see especially Humphreys' note, which is quoted on page 220). If, then, the burial is complete, how can there be a danger or a curse of pollution?

⁸ *Die dramatische Technik des Sophokles*, S. 33-34. Ewald Bruhn, in the Schneidewin-Nauack-Bruhn edition of *Sophocles' Antigone*, note 423, accepts Tycho von Wilmowitz-Moellendorff's judgment on the dramatic significance of the second burial.

⁹ *Shakespearean Tragedy*, page 20 (London, 1929).

¹⁰ R. C. Jebb, *Sophocles, The Antigone*, xxvii.

¹¹ *Soph. Ant.* 422 ff. (Jebb's translation).



LATIN AND THE ROMANS

New Edition

Latin becomes a living language with JENKINS AND WAGENER'S BOOK ONE! Students are introduced to Latin simply and naturally, with emphasis on reading for meaning. Principles of grammar are explained with relation to the reading. This New Edition provides more examples of the influence of Latin on English, exercises which stress meaning and translation rather than mechanical drill, a quicker introduction to reading. A helpful teachers' manual is available.

BOOK TWO, NEW EDITION, to be published this year. Write to

GINN AND COMPANY

Home Office: Boston • Sales Offices: New York 11 • Chicago 16
Atlanta 3 • Columbus 16 • San Francisco 3 • Toronto 5

INTRODUCTION TO LATIN

An Elementary Text for Colleges

By EUGENE W. MILLER, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor of Classics, University of Pittsburgh

Privately published by photo-offset printing from Vari-typed composition, in May, 1951.

Adopted for use in Fall, 1951, classes by 26 colleges and universities.

A text developed from *classroom experience*—used in mimeographed form with college classes for five years before it was published.

Emphasis on the reading of *continuous Latin*—no isolated Latin sentences after Lesson VII—continuous Latin selections, beginning with Lesson IX, including Ritchie's *Fabulae Faciles*, and selections from Eutropius, Nepos, Phaedrus, and Gellius.

Designed to cover the work of the *first year in college*.

Functional in approach—in so far as possible, *paradigms, syntax, and vocabulary* are incidental to their occurrence in the reading selections.

Complete appendix, *Latin-English vocabulary, English-Latin vocabulary, and index.*

xxi, 357 pages

Durable Cloth Binding

5½ by 8½ inches
\$3.00, net

An examination copy will be sent by the author upon request.

Please address:

Eugene W. Miller
Department of Classics, University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania

K
s
n
e
r
.

6
5

es
n-
f,

al

es
et